



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

# House of Commons Debates

---

VOLUME 147 • NUMBER 022 • 2nd SESSION • 41st PARLIAMENT

---

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

**Friday, November 22, 2013**

—

**Speaker: The Honourable Andrew Scheer**

## **CONTENTS**

(Table of Contents appears at back of this issue.)

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, November 22, 2013

The House met at 10 a.m.

---

*Prayers*

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

•(1005)

[*English*]

### DRUG-FREE PRISONS ACT

**Hon. Tim Uppal (for the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness)** moved that Bill C-12, an act to amend the Corrections and Conditional Release Act, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

**Ms. Roxanne James (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in the House today to speak to Bill C-12, the drug-free prisons act. I would like to seek unanimous consent to split my time with the member for Northumberland—Quinte West.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton):** Does the hon. parliamentary secretary have the unanimous consent of the House to split her time?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Ms. Roxanne James:** Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today gives new tools to the Parole Board of Canada to help ensure that prisoners remain drug-free, both inside the prison and while they are on parole.

I will speak to the details of this important common-sense bill in just a moment, but first allow me to give some background on what has brought us to this point.

The issue of drug use in our federal prisons is a serious concern to this government. Many Canadians may be surprised to learn that drug use is rampant in our prisons. Despite the best efforts of our front-line officers, the criminal element is still able to bring drugs into the penitentiaries.

The scope of the problem becomes clear when we look at the actual numbers. In the fiscal year 2010-11, close to 1,500 drug seizures took place in federal prisons. These are worrisome numbers. Our prisons are less safe and secure when there are drugs involved.

Our government has provided vital funding towards tackling drugs in prisons. In 2008, we committed \$122 million over five years towards developing and implementing a more rigorous approach to drug interdiction in our federal prisons. This funding has gone towards an expanded detector dog program, increased security intelligence capacity in institutions and communities, and enhanced partnerships with law enforcement organizations.

However, we did not stop there. We knew that Canadians remained concerned about this issue and that we had to move ahead with further concrete actions. To this end, our government made three commitments to Canadians in our 2011 Conservative platform, with a goal of creating drug-free prisons. These commitments would subject all prisoners to random drug testing, give stricter penalties to those found with contraband in prison, and deny prisoners parole if they fail a drug test.

As I mentioned, our first commitment in our 2011 Conservative platform was to put in place measures that ensure all prisoners undergo drug testing. To reach that goal, Correctional Service of Canada has recently increased its monthly random urinalysis testing from 5% of the prison population to 10%. With this increase, we now have a system in place that helps ensure each inmate is tested at least once per year, thereby fulfilling our commitment to capture samples from 100% of the prison population.

We have also made changes related to our second commitment, that the Correctional Service of Canada would refer serious cases to law enforcement for appropriate action. The Safe Streets and Communities Act, which Canadians know members opposite voted against, put in place mandatory minimum penalties for trafficking or possession of drugs in a prison or on prison property.

These measures move us closer to fulfilling our Conservative platform commitment to creating drug-free prisons. That brings me back to the drug-free prisons act, which would help us meet the third commitment in our 2011 Conservative platform by giving the Parole Board additional legislative tools to act as the strong authority and decision-making body that it should be.

*Government Orders*

Bill C-12 is straightforward. It proposes two amendments to the Corrections and Conditional Release Act.

First of all, the drug-free prisons act would provide the Parole Board of Canada with the specific authority to cancel parole after it had been granted and before the prisoner leaves the penitentiary, if that prisoner fails or refuses to take a drug test. This is an important change. Under this legislation, the Correctional Service of Canada would be required to provide that information to the Parole Board.

The second proposed change under the drug-free prisons act also supports the work of the Parole Board, allowing it to require parolees to stay off drugs. If the prisoner violates that condition, the Parole Board of Canada can revoke parole.

These proposed changes would allow our government to continue our significant work toward ending this illicit activity.

While we are busy and focused on the safety of our communities and reducing drug crime, the NDP brings forward dangerous suggestions, like providing needles to inmates. Not only is this giving hard-core drugs like heroin to prisoners—a really bad idea—it is a significant risk to the safety of our hard-working front-line correctional officers, not to mention the prisoners themselves.

We also see shameful acts by the leader of the Liberal Party, who goes to speak at grade schools to promote the legalization of illegal substances like marijuana to our children. This is shameful. Canadian families deserve much better.

There is no doubt that drug and alcohol abuse in our federal prisons presents a serious barrier to correcting criminal behaviour, which is why our Conservative government is fully committed to keeping illicit drugs out of the hands of prisoners.

I know there is some debate in some circles over whether we can successfully rid our prisons of drugs, alcohol and other contraband. I also know that we cannot and will not back away from this challenge. We will not turn a blind eye to this problem.

Our government will remain focused on initiatives that will help us tackle drugs and alcohol in our prisons. We will not back down from prioritizing the safety of our correctional officers. With the changes proposed in the drug-free prisons act, the parole board would have more specific authority to make decisions that have a significant impact on the safety of our communities.

I urge all members of the House, especially members opposite, who far too often are the champions of policies that are soft on crime, to support the rapid passage of this critical piece of legislation.

• (1010)

**Mr. Randall Garrison (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the parliamentary secretary's speech, and I think it once again ignores some basic facts. The Conservatives claim to be very proud about testing all prisoners for drugs, and they have found as a result of those tests that there are many people who are still using drugs in prison. The problem is that there are 3,000 people in prison on the wait list for addiction treatment programs.

Testing does not solve the problem; what solves the problem is treatment.

Does the government have any plans to address the real problem with something that would actually make a difference?

**Ms. Roxanne James:** Mr. Speaker, the Correctional Service of Canada spends between 2% and 5% annually, approximately \$150 million per year, of its total operating budget on core correctional programs, including those that deal with substance abuse. We are dealing with the particular question that the member had.

What I find most interesting, and I mentioned it in my speech, is that the member from the NDP, along with his entire caucus, wants to have a needle exchange program in prisons. On this side of the House, we do not think it is a good idea to give convicted criminals, with serious histories of violence, long, sharp, and pointy metal objects.

**Mr. Murray Rankin (Victoria, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, in her reply to my colleague, the parliamentary secretary indicated there was 2% to 5% spent annually on correctional programs, including those addressing substance abuse. To get more specific, exactly how much money is spent every year on dealing with substance abuse problems, which my colleague has indicated has led to 3,000 people in prison waiting for treatment for substance abuse?

**Ms. Roxanne James:** Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned, it is approximately \$150 million per year that Correctional Service of Canada spends on core correctional programs, including the substance abuse programs.

I want to make it clear that it is not the only thing it does. Our government has actually adopted a three-pronged approach to dealing with this issue in prisons. First with regard to increased interdiction, in 2008 the government invested \$122 million over five years to increase this process. Our efforts include drug detector dogs, security intelligence capacity and perimeter security. In addition to that, the third prong is deterrence through increased offender accountability and penalties. That was achieved through the Safe Streets and Communities Act, from 2012.

**Mr. Jasbir Sandhu (Surrey North, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary secretary mentioned that in 2008, \$110 million was spent on interdiction. I sat on the study of drugs in prisons. What we found was that the number of people who were testing positive for drugs before the \$110 million was spent and then after three years was about the same. In fact, the interdiction of \$110 million did not make any difference in the percentage of prisoners with some sort of drug in their systems.

Would the member agree that perhaps that money should have been spent on the demand side of it, helping those who are on the wait list to get into the programs to get off drugs?

*Government Orders*

**Ms. Roxanne James:** Mr. Speaker, we all agree in the House that drugs in prisons are a significant problem. Not only do they pose a threat to our hard-working front-line correctional officers, but they also pose a threat to the inmates themselves. It does a second thing. When someone is using illegal drugs in prisons, it impedes their rehabilitation process and their ability to actually use some of those abuse programs. It also presents public health issues.

According to Correctional Service of Canada, CSC, more than 80% of federal inmates have had a substance abuse problem that requires intervention. This was before they were actually incarcerated, in a year leading up to their offence. It is a serious problem. We are addressing it with our three-pronged approach.

Lastly, offenders who are in jail ought to be held accountable for their offences. We should not simply be turning a blind eye to illegal drug use and enabling them to continue with it.

● (1015)

**Mr. Rick Norlock (Northumberland—Quinte West, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in the House today to speak to Bill C-12, the drug-free prisons act. I would like to thank the parliamentary secretary for her comments.

I have spoken with many of my constituents about this important bill. Their response is always the same. They believe that it is common sense that our prisons, the places where we send the worst elements of society to become rehabilitated, be free of drugs and contraband. However, that is unfortunately not true. Every year, 1,700 prisoners receive discipline for failing drug tests.

There is no doubt that drug and alcohol abuse in our federal prisons presents a serious barrier to correcting criminal behaviour and creates an unsafe environment for correctional staff. That is why our Conservative government is wholly committed to keeping illicit drugs out of our prisons.

We promised Canadians in the 2011 election that we would test every prisoner for drugs at least once a year, create tougher penalties for those who possess or sell drugs in prison, and deny parole to those prisoners who fail drug tests. I am proud to report that we are delivering on these commitments.

We have increased random drug testing for prisoners. Now, 10% of prisoners are tested each month, meaning that 120% of the prison population is tested every year. We have invested significantly in drug interdiction, including having effective and well-trained detector-dog teams. We have created tough mandatory sentences for those who sell drugs in prisons.

Now we are bringing forward the drug-free prisons act, which will give the Parole Board the authority to cancel parole after a positive drug test. It will emphasize the fact that the Parole Board can impose conditions against the consumption of illegal drugs while on parole. It will define what a positive drug test means in law so that bureaucrats cannot be confused and let out prisoners who have clearly not had their behaviour corrected.

That is our record. Now let us look at where the opposition has stood. Rather than cracking down on drugs in prisons, the NDP has suggested a needle exchange program behind bars. Members heard me correctly. Not only do the New Democrats want to give illegal

drugs, such as heroin, to prisoners, they want to put more sharp metal objects in the hands of dangerous, convicted criminals. I wonder what front-line prison guards would have to say about the increased risks they would face should any misguided proposal like that occur.

Canada's largest medium-security institution is in my riding. I am very familiar with and speak on a frequent basis with the folks who work at one of Canada's largest prisons. I have been told time and time again that they would not be in favour of this.

The leader of the Liberal Party is focused solely on legalizing drugs, the kinds of drugs that change behaviour and send people to jail in the first place. The Liberals have never seen a common-sense measure to improve corrections that they did not oppose. Their leader even went so far, while he was out trolling for votes, as to go to a school in Brandon, Manitoba, to talk about how he wants to make it easier to get access to marijuana.

Our Conservative government will continue to take a comprehensive approach that includes interdiction, training for correctional officers, and treatment programs for prisoners.

I know that there is now a debate in some circles about whether we can successfully rid our prisons of drugs, alcohol, and other contraband. I also know that we cannot and will not back away from this challenge. Our government will remain focused on initiatives that will help us tackle drugs and alcohol in our prisons. We will not back down from prioritizing the safety of our correctional officers.

With the changes proposed in the drug-free prisons act, the Parole Board will have more specific authority to make decisions that have a significant impact on the safety of our communities. Thanks to the strong actions by our Conservative government, we can say that we are tackling this problem head on.

● (1020)

No longer would prison drug dealers be able to operate with impunity. No longer would the Parole Board be toothless in trying to revoke perks from drug-addicted prisoners, and no longer would prisoners be able to hide from drug tests by playing the numbers game.

I call on all members opposite to stop putting creature comforts, including illegal drugs, ahead of the rights of law-abiding Canadians. Join with the Conservative government and vote in favour of the bill.

*Government Orders*

**Ms. Jinny Jogindera Sims (Newton—North Delta, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, it is a laudable goal, and I do not think there is a person in this House who does not want to address substance abuse, and especially drug addiction.

It is a very important goal, but we also have to realize that more punitive measures do not fix the problem. What we need are real prevention programs and treatment programs.

One of the key things that concerns my constituents right now, besides the Conservatives' preoccupation with putting more people in prison, is affordable housing. Many of them feeling like prisoners in their own homes because of the high ratio of their incomes that goes into paying for their homes. Many of them cannot afford homes. The government is reducing the amount of money for low-income housing.

I am finding a little bit of a juxtaposition. I would ask my colleague what he feels should be done about affordable housing in communities.

**Mr. Rick Norlock:** Mr. Speaker, I can understand the hon. member trying to bring other issues into the debate on drug-free prisons, but this government has contributed more toward social housing than any other previous government, and we are committed to continuing that through the years.

Does saying that it is laudable and that we will never get rid of all the drugs in prisons mean that we should just give up? The average Canadian has a difficult time understanding how someone can be in a prison and still get access to drugs. I know how they do it, because I speak to the men and women who work in our prisons almost every week when I go home to my riding. There are many ingenious ways this occurs. Without going into the particulars, let me just talk about the goal.

Yes, it is a laudable goal, and it is difficult for Canadians to understand why people who are in our prisons have access to a plethora of drugs. That makes the prisons that much more difficult to control. In other words, it is difficult for the average prisoners who do not take drugs to go about their daily lives when they have someone next to them in a violent condition or in a condition that is unmanageable.

It is our goal to make sure that we do our best to keep drugs out of prisons, because that is what is expected of us as the government. All we are asking is that the opposition work with us. When it comes to programming, I will wait for some input.

**Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Cardigan, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate my hon. colleague's message, and I wish him good luck in keeping drugs out of prisons, because to this day, it has not been overly successful.

About 80% of the people who enter the prison system have a drug addiction problem. It is okay to put in more detector dogs. I agree that we should do everything to stop drugs from going into a prison. We put the detector dogs in place and stop parole. However, I would like to know why the government is opposed to addiction programs.

We are dealing with human beings. Why not deal with the human being and try to deal with the addiction problem in the prison system? Why did the government close the only addiction research

centre in the nation when over 80% of the people who are in our penal institutions have a drug or alcohol problem?

I wish that my hon. colleague would take a look at this situation and understand the value of research in the biggest problem in the penal institutions of this country. Would he not agree that we need research, and we need to have programs to deal with the people who are addicted in our system?

• (1025)

**Mr. Rick Norlock:** Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the public safety committee. We have a desire as a committee and as a government to see what else is happening in the world when we talk about drugs and alcohol in our prisons, and also mental illness, which is a tremendous problem. We understand that. We went across Canada to see what best practices work from one institution to another that we could import to or suggest for other Canadian institutions.

We then went overseas to Great Britain and Norway. In Norway, one of the questions I asked one of the top officials was what kind of programming they had. They mentioned some programs. I asked if they had ever adopted any Canadian programs. He said that yes, about 60% of their programs they had adopted from Canada. We are leaders when it comes to that.

When it comes to alcohol and addiction programs, we also have those programs in our institutions, and we have also, as a government, invested greatly in—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton):** Unfortunately, we went a little bit over in the time provided for questions and comments, but we will resume debate.

The hon. member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca.

**Mr. Randall Garrison (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on Bill C-12, an act to amend the Corrections and Conditional Release Act, the drug-free prisons act.

If members heard me speaking yesterday on the private member's bill, Bill C-483, they might think I would be happier today than I was yesterday. I was criticizing the Conservatives' use of private members' bills to amend the Criminal Code and the Corrections and Conditional Release Act, because using private members' bills avoids the scrutiny of charter compliance, results in less debate in the House of Commons and results in a piecemeal approach, amending various pieces of legislation without actually seeing what has happened with the previous amendments. I guess I am happier today because it is a government bill, so we will have more time to debate the bill. It has been scrutinized for its adherence to the charter and it probably avoids a piecemeal approach in that it has been examined by the department before being presented.

*Government Orders*

Then why am I not really happy this morning in comparison? It is because the bill illustrates yet another unfortunate tendency of the Conservatives, and that is a fondness for propagandistic titles that obscure the real content of the bill. This is much like Bill C-2, which is called respect for communities act, when in fact it is the opposite. Communities that want to set up safe injection sites to try to reduce the harm caused by the injection of drugs will be prevented by the provisions of Bill C-2 from actually doing so. Therefore, how is that respect for communities? It is directly the opposite.

This bill has an even wilder title. I would say that if we are ever doing a documentary on the legislative process and we use this as an example, the documentary should be called, "A Title in Search of a Bill". The Conservatives are wanting to send out to their members a piece of mail that would help them fundraise that says, "We passed a bill for drug-free prisons", but when we look inside the bill, there is very little, if anything, that contributes to the goal of drug-free prisons. I really do suspect the title has more to do with Conservative Party fundraising than it does to getting good public policy for prisons.

The public safety committee, of which I am the vice-chair, did a study on drugs and alcohol in federal prisons and more than 20 witnesses appeared at the committee. I did not agree with the government's report, in which the government produced 14 recommendations on drug-free prisons. However, in its bill on drug-free prisons not one of those recommendations, their own recommendations, appears. Instead, it is something else that appears in the bill. It is passing strange to me why the House of Commons committee would spend weeks hearing from dozens of expert witnesses and then the government would ignore that and introduce something completely different from that.

Maybe I should be happy because what is proposed in the bill is, in fact, a very modest change in the Corrections and Conditional Release Act, which simply makes more clear in law what is already the existing practice of the Parole Board. It says that the Parole Board of Canada can make use of positive results from drug tests or refusals to take urine tests for drugs when it makes decisions on parole eligibility. It already does this. It is just not clear in law, so this has a positive impact.

Giving clear legal authority to an existing practice is something New Democrats can support, so we are placed in an odd spot in the House of Commons. If we were voting on the title, we would vote against it, but the content of the bill we will actually support. Therefore, we will support the bill going to second reading and will be proposing a more realistic title. I am having trouble thinking of anything that could compete with a slogan such as "drug-free prisons", but I guess what we are going to look for is something that would actually tell the public what happens in the bill.

As I have said many times, drug-free prisons are, at best, a worthy aspiration, and at worst, simply a political slogan. It is not a policy. Saying we have a policy of drug-free prisons is like saying we have a policy against rainy days during our vacation. We cannot have a policy for drug-free prisons. We have to attack the addiction problem in prisons.

We are in an unfortunate situation in this country where 80% of those who end up in federal custody have drug or alcohol problems.

What do we do about that? The Conservatives, instead of having a really meaningful debate with us in the opposition, try to set up straw men and propose and tell the public what our policy is. Part of that is, I think, because they know the public does not really accept their policy, so they want to create phantoms for us to debate in the House of Commons.

● (1030)

The Conservatives are very quick to say that we are somehow condoning drug use or are soft on drugs on this side of the House. In fact, what we are saying on this side of the House is that we have to do things that would actually be effective in combatting the drug problem in prison and that would actually have better outcomes for the prisoners. It is not because we love the prisoners but it is because on this side of the House we are interested in public safety.

If people leave our prison system still addicted to drugs or alcohol, they will fall right back into the patterns that got them into prison in the first place. They will create more victims in our communities, and they will become victimized by their addiction.

In fact, we on this side of the House are not soft on drugs. We want an effective policy on drugs. Being tough on drugs is really much like being for drug-free prisons. Being tough on drugs accomplishes nothing.

The Conservative approach to drugs, both in and out of prison, is very consistent. They start with moral condemnation and then they finish with interdiction. It is the same approach that has inspired Bill C-2. We talk about safe injection sites, and the Conservatives say injectable drugs are bad and therefore we are going to try to prevent people from having a place where they can safely inject those drugs. It is moral condemnation followed by interdiction. It ignores the reality in terms of harm reduction.

The Conservatives did a mailing on Bill C-2, saying "Let's prevent having needles in your backyard." What do safe injection sites do? That is exactly what they do. They place people in safe injection sites so the needles do not end up in alleyways, school playgrounds or backyards. The Conservatives are actually doing quite the opposite of what they say they are doing.

When we look at the things that the Conservatives have tried to do on their goal of drug-free prisons since 2008, we see they have spent more than \$122 million on interdiction tools. That includes technology, such as ion sniffers, and sniffer dogs to try to stop drugs from entering the prisons.

What did we find? The head of corrections came to the committee during our study on drugs and alcohol in prisons, and interestingly this part of the testimony does not appear in the government's report. He said that after spending \$122 million and doing drug testing, the same percentage of prisoners tested positive as before the interdiction measures.

*Government Orders*

We wasted \$122 million on technology and sniffer dogs, instead of spending \$122 million on addiction treatment programs. If we want to get drugs out of prison, we have to reduce the demand for drugs in prison by offering people treatment programs.

I have to say there was a very unfortunate side effect of this emphasis on interdiction, and that was that it interfered with family visits. One of the things we know is very important, both to those who are going to reintegrate into the community and especially those with addictions, is family support.

At the time, the Conservatives criticized us for bringing this up, but what happened was that many family members felt the sniffer dogs facing them every time they tried to visit and bring their children was an intimidation factor that made it very difficult for them to visit. Even worse, the ion scanners produced an inordinate number of false positives. Many family members who would have nothing to do with drugs at all were prevented from visiting their relatives in prison because of the false positives of this technology, which really does not work in terms of interdiction.

Therefore, spending the \$122 million wasted money and interfered with family visits, and it interfered with rehabilitation programs. However, it is very consistent with the Conservative policy on drugs.

I guess we should have known this kind of thing was coming because in 2007 the Conservatives amended the national drug strategy. They took out one of the goals. The goal that they took out of the national drug strategy was harm reduction. It is very shocking. We actually removed harm reduction as one of the goals of our national drug strategy. Why? It is because the Conservative policy, again, is moral condemnation followed by interdiction, and it ignores the reality.

**An hon. member:** How about the mayor of Toronto?

**Mr. Randall Garrison:** I know some members are talking about some other very prominent people involved with drugs, especially in Toronto, who have not taken advantage of the treatment programs available and who have continued in office when many of us believe they ought not to.

However, we have to turn back to the question. If we are going to have a bill entitled drug-free prisons, then let us go back and look at why drugs are in the prisons. Again we come back to the fact that 80% of those convicted of criminal offences resulting in more than two years in prison have drug and alcohol problems.

• (1035)

What has been the major contributor to that? It is mandatory minimum sentences, another great Tory policy when it comes to drug-free prisons.

The real problem is not criminal behaviour. The real problem is social disorder caused by drug and alcohol problems. When someone appears before a judge and he or she may have drug or alcohol problems, the Conservatives want to take away the discretion of the judge to divert that person into a treatment program, and instead make him or her serve time because they are tough on drugs.

All that does, in fact, is put more addicts into prison and create a higher demand for drugs in prison.

When we talk about the lack of treatment, because of the way Corrections Canada keeps statistics on programming, it is difficult to identify, specifically, the number of those on waiting lists for addiction treatment. However, we know it is somewhere between 2,400 and 3,000 of those 15,000 people in prisons. Many of those prisoners will complete their sentences without ever getting the addiction treatment, and as I said earlier, they will end up back in the community, back in their old patterns, victimizing themselves and others, because of addiction.

In the parliamentary secretary's speech to open this debate, she talked about 2.7% of corrections funding going to programming.

Let us stop to think about that for a minute; 2.7% of the funding is going to programming. That means, really, what we are doing is warehousing our prisoners. As well, that is not addiction programming, that is all programming. That is all the training. That is all the rehabilitation. That 2.7% of the total budget is all the drug programming combined.

What is happening to the budget of public safety and specifically of corrections? The Conservatives, in the last budget, cut that budget by 10%. Cutting that budget by 10% at a time when the number of people who are being imprisoned is increasing because of the various Conservative mandatory minimum sentence and longer sentencing initiatives means that we are cutting the budget by 10% when the population in prison is increasing by about 5% every year.

The Conservatives like to stand to say, "Oh, no. We'll take the highest estimates anybody ever gave, the highest projections we ever had for prison, and we'll point out to you those were never achieved". That is to try to cover up the fact that the prison population is steadily increasing. Therefore, there are more people in prison, more people with addictions, less money and less programming. How in the world would this contribute to drug-free prisons?

The other thing that happens as a result of the increasing numbers and the decreasing budget is reduced training opportunities in prison.

Why am I talking about training opportunities and drug addiction in the same breath?

One of the problems that people have in prison is not having enough to do. There is an old saying that idle hands do the devil's work. Why in the world are we cutting back on training opportunities in prison?

The federal institution in my riding, William Head, has now lost the carpentry apprenticeship program. Why did it lose that? It was because of cutbacks. When the instructor retired, he was not replaced. Therefore, we have no more carpentry apprenticeship program.

We know that in all of the provinces across the country we have severe shortages in the trades. There are great opportunities for people to get employment when they get out of prison. We could keep them occupied in prison with a very useful training program that would result in employment that might keep them out of poverty and addiction problems when they get out. However, because of budget cuts, we do not replace the instructor when he retires.



*Government Orders*

William Head has a very good electrical apprenticeship program. The bad news is that the instructor is just about to retire. What will happen when he retires? It is very clear. It has already been announced; he will not be replaced. Now we will lose the electrical apprenticeship program, as well as the carpentry apprenticeship program.

To me, if we are really talking about how to do what is best for public safety, what is best for the community, and yes, in this case, what is also best for those who have offended, we are going in completely the wrong direction.

Part of the problem, we know, is that for addicts in prison, where there is a will there is a way. The Conservatives have tried to devise technology and other interdiction methods that would stop drugs from getting into prisons. That is probably a hopeless task. Even if we could interdict drugs, then prisoners would resort to the use of other substances, which would be even more damaging to them in that prison setting. They would make homemade alcohol, which will sometimes cause very serious injury, blindness or death. They would find a way.

• (1040)

One of the other things that has contributed to drugs in prison is an unusual one, and that is the Conservatives' fascination with privatization. Let me draw the connection for people who would not see it immediately.

Conservatives would like to have things like laundry, food service and cleaning in the prison contracted out. That is happening more and more across the country. That brings low-paid workers into the prison system, who are not hired by Correctional Service Canada, who only have the most basic screening and, because they are most often paid the minimum wage, are in very vulnerable positions. We have had many examples already where the path to drugs in prison comes through those private sector employees who come through the gate everyday. It is very easy for criminal gangs to identify who those people are. I am not saying these are evil people. It is very easy for them to be identified, for pressure to be put on their families and for them to bring drugs into prison. We have had many examples of privatization actually leading to an increase in the drug supply in prisons.

I will go ahead and talk a bit more about the problem of reduced budget.

One of the things Correctional Service Canada has had to do is try to find more efficient ways of delivering programming. Regarding the programs that the member for Northumberland—Quinte West liked to point to that were adopted around the world, there is not enough money for those programs to be run in our prisons anymore. Therefore, the corrections officials have taken what were separate anger management, drug addiction and other of those initial programs and they have rolled them together into one program that inmates will initially go through. This program tries to deal with all of these problems at the same time. I wish the designers of the program well, and I hope that it works. However, I am very concerned that we are, for fiscal reasons, taking those programs, which were so effective in dealing with some of the problems that people came into prison with, combining them into one program and doing an experiment in our prisons to see if that works as well as

those programs we know were very effective programs that were adopted in places like Norway and were seen around the world as exemplary kinds of programs.

Another program that has been reduced or eliminated in many of the institutions in Ontario is called CORCAN. It provided vocational kinds of training so when people got out of prison, they could escape the circumstances that led them perhaps into addiction and therefore into crime.

However, the other thing the Conservatives have done is questioned why prisoners who take part in this training are paid. They have suggested we take away the pay for participating in CORCAN. This was not high pay, not even minimum wage pay, but it is an incentive for prisoners to get involved in the CORCAN training programs, which will lead them to better opportunities in their new life outside prison.

In fact, we have had a situation going on in Canadian prisons where we have had work stoppages because of the low pay that is offered to prisoners who do meaningful work while they are in prison. Because of this straw man, the Conservatives like to parade about the luxurious conditions in prison, at the same time, they have increased the number of items that prisoners have to pay for themselves. I think many Canadians would be surprised to know prisoners have to buy their own soap, toothpaste and shampoo out of the very minimal amount they are paid for work in prison.

The Conservatives like to draw a picture, saying that no one pays for their toothpaste or shampoo, but my point is not that they should not have to pay for these things, but that when they do work in the prison system, they should be able to earn enough money so they can pay for those basic necessities.

Once again, coming back to what our real policies are on this side of the House, and not the straw man the Conservatives like to put up, the NDP has always been steadfast in our support for measures that will make our prisons safe. The Conservative government has ignored recommendations from the corrections staff, the corrections union and the correctional investigator, all of these recommendations that were aimed at decreasing violence, gang activity and drug use in our prison.

Stakeholders agree that the bill would have a minimal impact on drugs in prison. Therefore, those who have listened to my speech will know I am not opposed to what is being proposed in the bill. What I am opposed to is the propaganda of its title and the whole Conservative approach of moral condemnation followed by interdiction, instead of measures that would really attack the drug problem in our prisons and our society.

What we really need to do is focus on addiction programming in our prisons if we want to achieve or move toward the goal of drug-free prisons.

*Government Orders*

•(1045)

**Mr. Rick Norlock (Northumberland—Quinte West, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I have a few comments. When we have an argument that we want to get across and we are to agree with a person that we really do not want to agree with, what do we do? We make a joke about it. We make fun of it and we belittle it. It degrades what we are trying to do, so we belittle it.

Then we go to another tact and say that there they go, being moralistic again. God forbid anybody in this place should have any morals. Yes, we do have morals. Everyone in this chamber has morals. There is nothing wrong with putting some morality and some of those issues into law, the way we do things and how we act. The opposition says that the government is overly moralistic, which is why it does this and it is tough on that.

One of the other things is that they are trying to keep drugs out of prisons. It is really being hard on families and some of the families do not like to come, but that is how some of the drugs are getting into our prisons, through conjugal visits. It is so bad when they say that they do not want to have their kids exposed to these little electronic instruments, but that is how some of the drugs are getting in. They are in the diapers of children, where the guards cannot go. We are told that. They even admit it.

There is much more to talk about than I have time for, but I wish that for once, if the opposition members are going to support something, they would just say they are going to support it. They do not like us or agree with us, but they are going to support it.

**Mr. Randall Garrison:** Mr. Speaker, I have worked with the member for Northumberland—Quinte West on committee and he knows that it is not about me not liking or respecting him. I do respect his experience. I differ with him on the proper solutions.

I am sorry if he felt ridiculed by the beginning of my speech, but a bill entitled “drug-free prisons” that has nothing in it to accomplish drug-free prisons is legitimately subject to some ridicule.

When he says that I object to them having morals, no I do not. Of course we all have moral standards. What I am saying is that moral condemnations do not produce results. That is my problem with the overall Conservative approach to drugs and, in particular, this bill. Calling it a drug-free prison bill is more of that moral condemnation, which is very ineffective in dealing with our real problems.

•(1050)

**Hon. Hedy Fry (Vancouver Centre, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the hon. member's speech and he made some very valid points. I wanted to ask him, with a view to the last question he just answered about morality, does he believe that addiction is a chronic, relapsing medical condition and therefore should not be subject to morality any more than we should judge people who are diabetics?

This is a grey issue with regard to the issue of the amount of dopamine that people make in their brains, which makes them an addict or not. To treat addiction, instead of with public health concerns and public health policies, does the member agree that it should be treated as a medical condition and not as a crime and punishment is issue?

**Mr. Randall Garrison:** Mr. Speaker, perhaps this is something I neglected to say in my conclusion due to running out of time, but I could not agree more with the member. Addiction is a health problem.

One of the things we have seen with Bill C-2, which deals with safe injection sites, is that instead of going to the health committee for study, it is being sent to the public safety committee. This somehow implies that safe injection sites are a threat to public safety and public health, instead of a support to public safety and an important measure to improve public health.

What I am saying about morality is that I do not object to the Conservatives having morality. I object to them trying to apply their morality to problems that will not be solved by moral condemnation because they are not moral problems, they are addiction problems.

**Mr. Jasbir Sandhu (Surrey North, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, Conservatives stand in the House and talk about their management of the economy and how wonderful they are doing in regard to creating jobs. The facts are that it is under the current government that we have had the largest deficit and have accumulated hundreds of billions of dollars in debt.

When the Conservatives formed government, we had a \$26 billion surplus in trade. Now we have \$62 billion in trade deficits. This is their economic record.

The reason I brought that up is that in 2008, the government put in \$122 million into interdictions in prisons. What effect did that \$122 million have or could we have used that \$122 million somewhere else where we could have received more benefits?

**Mr. Randall Garrison:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Surrey North for his participation in the study on drugs in prisons, which was done at committee.

The \$122 million, as the head of Correctional Service Canada said, was wasted. At the end of this, we have the same number of prisoners testing positive for drugs as we did at the beginning.

I want to go back to something the member for Northumberland—Quinte West raised, implying that I supported family members smuggling drugs into prison. Of course, I do not. What I object to is the same thing I talked about yesterday, and that is the Conservatives' tendency to take the extreme examples and make the rule from it.

Most of the families that are visiting prisoners with addiction problems want nothing more than for those relatives to conquer those addiction problem, come home to them and be a productive and useful member of their own community. Singling out the exceptional and trying to make policy on that basis is something to which I always object.

**Mr. Dennis Bevington (Western Arctic, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, this subject is one which my colleague in his speech has dealt with incredibly well because when we look at the results of the Conservative program over the last number of years in the interdiction of drugs in prisons, it has been very unsuccessful.

*Statements by Members*

Does my colleague want to take that argument further into how those funds could better have been put into programs that would lead to rehabilitation, that would lead to a decline in drug and hard drug use in prisons?

• (1055)

**Mr. Randall Garrison:** Mr. Speaker, the question from the member for Western Arctic gets right to the heart of the matter, which is that we have a shortage of funding in our prison system right now for addiction treatment programs.

Again, if we want to reduce the presence of drugs in prison, in my view and in the view of the people we heard at committee, we need to reduce the demand for drugs in prison by providing addiction treatment programs.

The \$122 million would have gone a long way to closing that gap of the waiting list, which is somewhere between 2,500 and 3,000 prisoners who need addiction treatment programs. It would have gone a long way to filling that gap and would have been much more effective than wasting it on this effort at interdiction.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is an interesting bill that we have before us. It is something the Conservative Party is fairly good at. They have someone working in the Prime Minister's Office whose job is quite simple: come up with creative names for bills to make the Conservatives look good in the eyes of the public. Whether it is reflected in the bill or the substance of the legislation is somewhat irrelevant; the PMO staffer's primary goal is to get that communication piece out.

So what has the PMO said today on Bill C-12?

Well, the message it wants to get out to Canadians is “drug-free prisons”. This is what it wants to achieve. Some on that side might actually applaud, but one questions if it is possible to achieve what the government is trying to give the impression to Canadians that it is going to achieve. I do not believe it is possible.

I believe that if one were to canvass individuals who have the expertise, which obviously is lacking on the government benches, one would find out that in fact it is not achievable. However, do not let that confuse the member who came up with the idea in the Prime Minister's Office, because that conflicts with the message the Conservatives are hoping to give Canadians, albeit somewhat false.

That said, interestingly, there was an observation made in the 2011-2012 annual report from the Correctional Investigator with respect to the prevalence of drugs within our prisons, and I quote:

A “zero-tolerance” stance to drugs in prison, while perhaps serving an effective deterrent posted at the entry point of a penitentiary, simply does not accord with the facts of crime and addiction in Canada or elsewhere in the world.

This is not coming from a member of the Liberal caucus, but from stakeholders out there in the real world, and that is part of the problem. We need to get more of the staff inside the PMO to get out into the real world to get a better understanding of reality.

I had the opportunity to tour many of Canada's penitentiaries and retention centres, and I believe there is plenty of room for improvement. Let there be no doubt that there is a lot of room for improvement. I for one will not object to moving forward, but I think we have to take the issue of addiction—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton):** I am sorry to interrupt. The hon. member will have sixteen and a half minutes remaining for his remarks when the House next resumes debate on the motion.

---

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

• (1100)

[*Translation*]

### SUPPLY MANAGEMENT

**Mr. André Bellavance (Richmond—Arthabaska, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, eight years ago today, the Bloc Québécois motion on supply management was unanimously adopted. We went through an emotionally charged day, along with the dairy, egg and poultry producers of Quebec, because we were not sure whether we would achieve unanimity until the very last minute.

Indeed, in committee, the Conservatives had joined with the Liberals to defeat a similar motion. For eight years, the Bloc Québécois motion effectively constituted the Canadian negotiation policy and ensured that the supply management sectors were protected.

Still with Quebec producers, we also adopted a motion on imports of milk proteins. The government ultimately betrayed dairy farmers, especially our Quebec cheese makers, with the recent free trade agreement with Europe. We had already sounded the alarm when, for the first time, the government left supply management on the table during international negotiations.

The federal government must now meet its commitment for a compensation plan and ensure better border control to protect Quebec's remarkable cheese industry.

\* \* \*

[*English*]

### WILLIAM FRASER BELL

**Mr. Costas Menegakis (Richmond Hill, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today in the House to honour the memory of the late William Fraser Bell. Bill was a devoted family man, an outstanding gentleman and a mentor. Bill leaves a legacy of exemplary contributions to Richmond Hill, to Ontario, and to Canada. He is the longest-serving mayor in Richmond Hill's history, having been elected to that office six consecutive times.

Some of his proudest career accomplishments include the establishment of the Richmond Hill Centre for the Performing Arts, co-founding Hill House Hospice, the state-of-the-art Richmond Hill Public Library, and because of sound financial decisions during his tenure, enabling council to make a significant donation to help build the Richmond Hill wing at Mackenzie Health Hospital.

Bill Bell will always be remembered as a giant in our community. I am personally immensely grateful for his wise and sage advice. My deepest sympathies go out to his loving wife Jackie; their daughters Julie and Kate; their grandsons Hunter, Thomas, and Charlie; and his brother John.

*Statements by Members***OFFICER OF THE ORDER OF CANADA**

**Mr. Murray Rankin (Victoria, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, today I have the great honour to rise in the House to congratulate the former premier of British Columbia, Mike Harcourt, who has been named an Officer of the Order of Canada, one of the highest distinctions in our country.

Mr. Harcourt has had an exemplary career. He has made an enormous contribution to Canada as a city councillor, mayor of Vancouver, leader of the B.C. NDP, and of course, as premier of British Columbia. He has also served as an inspiration and powerful advocate for those affected by a disability, following his own remarkable recovery from a spinal cord injury.

I have had the privilege of working closely with Mike over the years on issues of environmental protection and treaty negotiations. Based on my personal experience, I can say without hesitation he is also an incredibly kind person with a famously positive attitude and approach to life. I cannot think of anyone more deserving of this wonderful tribute.

Congratulations to Mike.

\* \* \*

**FOOD PROCESSING FACILITY IN COLBORNE**

**Mr. Rick Norlock (Northumberland—Quinte West, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Northumberland County Economic Development and Tourism is currently designing and constructing a niche food processing food facility in Colborne, Ontario, to support second-source revenues from farming operations and to build on the concept of field to fork as an integral part of our community and business development.

The Ontario agri-food venture centre is supported by our government through the eastern Ontario development program with a \$200,000 combined contribution from the Northumberland CFDC and five surrounding regional CFDCs. The projected 15,000-square-foot facility will serve the eastern Ontario agricultural community as a means to help grow local food enterprises, to extend the seasonality of locally grown fruits and vegetables through packaging and freezing processes, and to carry out marketing and product development for emerging enterprises.

This project is yet another example of how our Conservative government is supporting farmers and local businesses in eastern Ontario.

\* \* \*

**GREY CUP**

**Hon. Ralph Goodale (Wascana, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan is the province that is the easiest to draw but the hardest to spell. We have the longest bridge over the shortest span of water in the world. Twice each year we fight the scourge of daylight savings time. Saskatchewan invented everything from Girl Guide cookies to medicare, and we have had our football team since 1910, years before there was even a CFL or a Grey Cup. We bleed green. Our most sainted symbol is a gopher.

On Sunday the greatest fans in the world will trek to Regina. They will come from North Portal in the south and from Southend in the

north, from Eastend in the west and from West Bend in the east. We will welcome back to Saskatchewan Austin, Fantuz, and Burris and all their friends from Hamilton. Then there are Durant, Sheets, Dressler, Getzlaf, Bagg, and Simon, and I wish I could name them all, will finish what they set out to do in the spring: they will make the Saskatchewan Roughriders the 101st Grey Cup champions.

Go Riders!

\* \* \*

● (1105)

**VOLUNTEER SEARCH AND RESCUE ORGANIZATIONS**

**Mr. Dan Albas (Okanagan—Coquihalla, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, this past weekend, with citizens of Merritt and the surrounding areas, I participated in a volunteer search and rescue effort. We were looking for Dean Morrison, a missing 44-year-old man and father of three. Sadly, we were not successful in our efforts.

This was my first experience working with local search and rescue volunteers. It is truly heartening that so many citizens give so generously of their time to help find missing loved ones.

I know that there are volunteer search and rescue organizations in many of our communities across this great country. I would ask the House to take a moment to collectively give thanks for the very good work that they do.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**CANADA'S FOOD BANKS**

**Mr. Alain Giguère (Marc-Aurèle-Fortin, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, with the holidays approaching, I would like to take a moment to wish everyone a merry Christmas and a happy new year in advance.

Unfortunately, not everyone shares in this time of joy. A growing number of Canadians rely on food banks to help meet the basic need of having food to eat. At this time, on behalf of everyone here, I would like to thank all those who work or volunteer at food banks, who help those less fortunate put food on the table. During this holiday season, I would also like to congratulate them on their strong sense of community.

My friends, Canada remains a generous country because of the hard work of these extraordinary people. It is true that during the holidays, Canada is a wonderful country.

In order to make the holidays a time of peace and happiness for everyone, I would invite all Canadians to follow the example of those who work and volunteer at food banks and to give generously to those organizations.

*Statements by Members*

[English]

**GAS TAX FUND**

**Mr. Maurice Vellacott (Saskatoon—Wanuskewin, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the second installment of our Conservative government's annual \$2 billion federal gas tax fund is being made available. Saskatchewan's total allocation this year is now close to \$56.1 million.

Canada's gas tax fund provides predictable long-term funding for Canadian municipalities to help them build and revitalize their local infrastructure while creating jobs and long-term prosperity. This money has funded numerous initiatives across Saskatchewan that support water and waste water infrastructure, local roads, public transit, solid waste disposal, community energy systems, and transportation improvements. Projects are chosen locally and prioritized according to the infrastructure needs of each community.

To date, close to \$371.9 million has been made available to Saskatchewan under the current gas tax fund. Our government has extended, doubled, indexed, and made permanent the gas tax fund. Thus the fund grows from its current \$2 billion per year while providing provinces and municipalities with predictable funding to deliver on local infrastructure priorities. That is a very good thing.

\* \* \*

**TYPHOON HAIYAN RELIEF EFFORTS**

**Mr. Joe Daniel (Don Valley East, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express gratitude from my constituents of Don Valley East for the relief efforts of our government in the aftermath of Typhoon Haiyan and for the generosity of all Canadians across the country for helping those affected by this tragedy.

In my riding of Don Valley East, I would especially like to acknowledge the outstanding efforts of Mario Calagio, who has worked tirelessly to acquire clothes, canned food, and financial donations for the affected people of the Philippines.

A tragedy of this magnitude will take years of effort to replace, repair, and rebuild back to normal.

I take this opportunity to remind everyone that they can continue to donate to the Typhoon Haiyan Relief Fund until December 9, as our government will match dollar for dollar the money that is raised.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**LOUISEVILLE CHRISTMAS TELETHON**

**Ms. Ruth Ellen Brosseau (Berthier—Maskinongé, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I am very worried about the growing number of people living below the poverty line. Every year, food bank statistics make me shudder.

Food banks and donors play a crucial role. It is unbelievable that, in 2013, in a country as rich as Canada, so many people cope with poverty every day and food banks have become a permanent solution.

On Wednesday evening, I attended a Christmas spaghetti dinner for Louiseville's Noël du pauvre campaign. I would like to

congratulate Pierrette Plante, the organizing committee and la Porte de la Mauricie on setting up a wonderful evening.

For the past 55 years, people's generosity during the Noël du pauvre telethon has made it possible for nearly 4,600 families to celebrate Christmas fittingly. Close to 2,000 volunteers contribute to the success of the telethon, which will be broadcast beginning at 5 p. m. on December 6 on Radio-Canada Mauricie-Centre-du-Québec television.

Congratulations to everyone involved. I am proud of the solidarity I have witnessed in my community, and I am really proud to represent you.

\* \* \*

● (1110)

[English]

**THE ECONOMY**

**Mr. John Williamson (New Brunswick Southwest, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, when it comes to economic stewardship, our government is leading the world. We have witnessed the creation of over one million net new jobs, signed the Wayne Gretzky of trade deals with Europe and stayed on track to balance the budget. We also cut the GST and created the tax-free savings account, benefiting more than eight million hard-working Canadians.

Canada has weathered the global economic downturn because we have a plan. Unfortunately, the Liberal leader has no plan. While we create better policy in Canada, the Liberal leader admires China's basic dictatorship. While the Prime Minister successfully travels the globe promoting trade and Canada's values, the Liberal leader parades around Canada promoting marijuana growth, including to school kids.

While an inexperienced Liberal leader pushes pot, we will continue to create the economic conditions for jobs and growth for all Canadians.

\* \* \*

**THE ENVIRONMENT**

**Mr. Dennis Bevington (Western Arctic, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of the Environment seems to be the only northerner who does not understand climate change. As she took her seat at the UN Climate Change Conference in Warsaw, a European report found, "Canada still shows no intention of moving forward with climate policy and therefore remains the worst performer of all industrialized countries".

Meanwhile, the minister continues to mouth empty platitudes about how hard the Conservatives are working on climate change. However, Environment Canada's analysis shows Canada fell further behind in meeting its 2020 targets. While the minister fiddles, her constituents and mine are suffering. Inuit elders, hunters and others have told the Nunavut environment department that sea ice conditions have changed, there is more rain with snow later in the year, the stability of the permafrost is changing and traditional Inuit seasons have changed drastically.

*Statements by Members*

When it comes to climate change, the minister is only willing to mouth PMO talking points, when she should be working for northerners.

\* \* \*

**THE ECONOMY**

**Mrs. Kelly Block (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House, our government has focused on what matters to Canadians: jobs and economic growth. That is why we implemented our responsible resource development plan, which recognizes the importance of balancing environmental protection with economic development.

Natural resource development supports 1.8 million Canadian jobs and \$30 billion annually in royalties and taxes to governments to support important programs such as health care and education. Yet on that side of the House, the New Democrats just do not get it. The orange bloc no development party opposes all resource projects. It opposes hydrocarbon development, mining projects, the nuclear industry, and it even opposes the forestry sector.

When will the NDP start sticking up for Canadian jobs and Canadian families?

\* \* \*

**GREY CUP**

**Mr. Frank Valeriote (Guelph, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the field is set: showdown under the prairie sky. The 101st Grey Cup: Steeltown versus Queen City. Who will be victorious?

In one end, the mighty Hamilton Tiger Cats; in the other end, some guys dressed in green. After clawing their way from behind in the CFL East final, the Ticats devoured the Toronto Argonauts to win 36 to 24. Under the leadership of head coach Kent Austin, the Ticats have touched down in Riderville to stalk their prey, hunt the pig skin, and sprint to victory. While the Ticats may not be in their natural habitat, they will mark their territory and bring the cup home to Hamilton.

As the member of Parliament for Guelph, I would like to thank the Hamilton Ticats for choosing Guelph's Alumni Stadium as their home away from home. They have entertained us, brought our community together in the celebration of sport and contributed to Guelph's prosperity. Tigers, eat 'em raw.

Go, Ticats, go.

\* \* \*

•(1115)

**HEALTH**

**Ms. Eve Adams (Mississauga—Brampton South, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, during the local Brandon byelection debate last night, the Liberal candidate said that marijuana should be controlled the same way that tobacco is. Can you believe that, Mr. Speaker? How irresponsible of a policy is that?

Smoking rates among our youth are already too high. The Liberal Party and the Liberal candidate clearly missed the memo that 16% of Canadian youth are still smoking. That is why our government has been working hard to reduce those smoking rates. The Liberals

should get on board with our approach, which is aimed at helping to ensure Canadian youth are healthy and productive and are not smoking cigarettes or marijuana.

Our government is working toward a zero per cent smoking average for youth. It is a shame that the Liberal candidate in Brandon and the Liberal leader do not agree.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**ETHICS**

**Mr. Yvon Godin (Acadie—Bathurst, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, back home in New Brunswick, people were already ticked off at the Conservatives for giving their buddies overpaid jobs for life, when New Brunswickers cannot even get their employment insurance, which they paid for with their own money. Now the double standard has gone even further.

Sylvie Therrien had the courage to blow the whistle on the unfair quotas imposed on employment insurance inspectors that forced them to go after the unemployed. Well, the Conservatives fired her. When it comes to their friend Irving Gerstein, who conspired to cover up Mike Duffy's crimes and tried to use his contacts to change the Deloitte report, there were no consequences.

If the Conservatives are as tough on crime as they claim, they should leave whistle-blowers and the unemployed alone and instead throw out Gerstein. They treat the unemployed like criminals, when the real criminals are their buddies in the Senate. They should be ashamed.

\* \* \*

[English]

**ETHICS**

**Mrs. Susan Truppe (London North Centre, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday we learned the shocking reports that disgraced Liberal Senator Colin Kenny was removed from his caucus over accusations of sexual harassment.

The victim says he made inappropriate sexual comments, asked her to wear high-heeled shoes and repeatedly put his hand on her waist when the office door was closed. Even worse, the leader of the Liberal Party's office ignored the victim's plea for help for three months, as she had notified them in August that she was being harassed.

On behalf of Canadian women from coast to coast, I would like to express our outrage and my deepest sympathies to the alleged victim. The Standing Committee on the Status of Women is currently finalizing a study on sexual harassment. We have learned that sexual harassment is a form of violence, with a tremendous impact on the health, well-being and economic security of women.

Our government will continue to focus on eliminating all forms of violence against women and girls.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

[Translation]

### ETHICS

**Ms. Nycole Turmel (Hull—Aylmer, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, the Prime Minister said that when he told Nigel Wright he was “good to go”, he was saying that Mr. Duffy should repay his own expenses.

Why did Mike Duffy need authorization from the Prime Minister to repay his own expenses?

[English]

**Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, as we could see through all of the documentation that the member is referring to, Senator Duffy, right to the end, was trying to justify these inappropriate expenses.

The Prime Minister was very forceful in the fact that Senator Duffy had to repay these inappropriate expenses on behalf of taxpayers.

[Translation]

**Ms. Nycole Turmel (Hull—Aylmer, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, just after the Prime Minister gave the nod to Nigel Wright, negotiations began with the Conservative Party for repayment of \$32,000 of Mike Duffy's expenses.

If the Prime Minister approved the \$32,000 repayment plan, how is it plausible that he was not aware of the \$90,000 repayment plan?

[English]

**Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, as the Prime Minister responded in this House yesterday, he did not do such thing. He did not approve of the Conservative Party paying back any of the funds. As we know, the Conservative Party did not pay back any of the inappropriate funds of Senator Duffy.

The Prime Minister was very clear to the senator when he tried to justify his inappropriate expenses that he repay those expenses that he did not incur.

[Translation]

**Ms. Nycole Turmel (Hull—Aylmer, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, when the chair of the Conservative Party's fundraising arm, Senator Irving Gerstein, realized that the party would have to pay back \$90,000 and not \$32,000, what did he say to the Prime Minister?

• (1120)

[English]

**Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC):** Again, Mr. Speaker, I think Senator Gerstein made an announcement at our convention that the Conservative Party would not pay the \$90,000 of inappropriate expenses that Senator Duffy had incurred.

We expect on this side of the House, and we were told, that Senator Duffy used his own resources to pay those expenses back. We obviously know that was not true. What is very evident from these documents that the opposition is referring to is that it is Nigel

### Oral Questions

Wright and Senator Duffy who are being investigated by the RCMP at this point.

**Mr. Murray Rankin (Victoria, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, we are talking about a cover-up involving a large group in the office of the Prime Minister of Canada.

The Prime Minister claims that when Nigel Wright spoke to him on February 22, his chief of staff was seeking permission for Mike Duffy to pay back his expenses.

Can the member explain, then, why Mike Duffy would need permission from the Prime Minister to pay back his own expenses?

**Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC):** As I just answered, Mr. Speaker, the member is referring to documents. In those documents it is quite evident that throughout Senator Duffy was trying to justify these inappropriate expenses constantly.

He was told on February 13 by the Prime Minister that he needed to repay these inappropriate expenses. He kept trying to defend these expenses. They were not appropriate. He needed to have those repaid.

We were subsequently told, all Canadians were told, that he did that using his own resources. We know that not to be true. However, we also know, as stated on page 72 of the same document that he refers to, that the Prime Minister did not know of the arrangement between Nigel Wright and Senator Duffy.

**Mr. Murray Rankin (Victoria, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, Canadians deserve better than sham responses like that. We are talking about improper expense claims, PMO-orchestrated cover-up, whitewash of an audit and a continuing police investigation.

According to the RCMP, Senators Tkachuk and Gerstein tried to ensure the audit would go away. They knew an investigation into Mike Duffy's residence could raise additional trouble with the Conservatives.

Was the Prime Minister aware of the problems surrounding Senator Duffy's residency?

**Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC):** Again, Mr. Speaker, on February 13, the Prime Minister was very clear to Senator Duffy when he was approached by the senator to try to justify his inappropriate expenses. He told him he had to repay those expenses. He then went on TV and said that he had repaid those expenses using his own resources. We know that not to be true.

What these documents also show is that the Prime Minister took immediate action. When he found out about this on May 15, he ordered his office to work with and assist the RCMP, freeze any emails, provide any information that they needed. It also shows on page 72 that this Prime Minister did not know the scheme that had been hatched. Had he known, he would have in no way endorsed such a plan.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is campaigning in Manitoba today. My question is related to the fraud squad.

*Oral Questions*

Manitobans want to know why the taxpayers from Manitoba are still paying for the salaries of four Conservative senators and three Conservative staffers, all of whom the RCMP have alleged were participants in the PMO–Duffy payment and cover-up.

**Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the member mentioned this question yesterday, as well. The Prime Minister, as we know, was in Lac-Mégantic yesterday making a very important announcement with respect to funds to assist the people of Lac-Mégantic. We also know that the Prime Minister has shown extraordinary leadership with respect to the Philippines and the devastation that has been caused there.

He might call that campaigning. We call that governing. We call that looking after the priorities of Canadians. Whether it is in Newfoundland or B.C., across this country, Canadians know they can count on this Prime Minister and this government to spread their values to work on their behalf before, during, and after an election.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the member can say what he will, but everyone knows that the Prime Minister is in Manitoba today because he is scared of what is happening in Manitoba. That is the reality. He is out there campaigning.

My question is in regard to Patrick Rogers. He is the policy director for the current Conservative minister from Saint Boniface. He is being allowed to keep his job. Why? The RCMP has alleged that he also has been involved in the PMO whitewashing of the Senate report and scandal.

**Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, what is scary is that the leader of the Liberal Party would go to an elementary school and talk about legalizing marijuana. That is what is scary. What is scary is a Liberal Party that wants to undo all of the gains that western Canadians have seen. They want to reverse marketing freedom for our farmers. They want to reinstate the gun registry. Their only major economic plank, of course, is to reorganize crime so they can tax marijuana.

I do not think the people of Manitoba want that type of person leading their government. What they want is a government that will cut taxes, work for them, work for their families, and work hard every single day before, during, and after an election for the values Canadians think are so important.

• (1125)

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, what is scary is that absolutely no one believes this Prime Minister. What is scary is that we have a fraud squad that works out of the Prime Minister's Office or have been disseminated out of the Prime Minister's Office.

Since the Prime Minister's deputy chief of staff, Jenni Byrne, worked directly for both Dan Hilton and Senator Gerstein, both of whom the RCMP allege knew about the dirty deeds, what did she know, and why is she leading the campaign in Brandon, Manitoba?

**Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, in fact, we have a great candidate in Brandon—Souris who is leading that effort to make sure that the people of Brandon—Souris still have

a member of Parliament they can count on, a member of Parliament who is not just visiting the riding for the purposes of an election. They do not need a Toronto Liberal telling them that all the things they believe in are wrong. They do not need a Toronto Liberal telling them that legalizing marijuana is the most important thing that this government should be looking at.

What they want is a Conservative who will represent them before, during, and after an election, who will focus on their priorities, who will focus on their values, who will bring continued economic prosperity to the people of Manitoba. That is what they will get from the candidate in Brandon—Souris.

**Mr. Robert Chisholm (Dartmouth—Cole Harbour, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, RCMP documents show that Senator Irving Gerstein was actively helping to clean up the mess around the audit into Mike Duffy's residency and expenses. Senator Gerstein even called someone he knew at Deloitte, somebody, by the way, who just happened to be a maximum donor to the Conservative Party. Was the Prime Minister aware that Senator Gerstein attempted to use his influence to alter that audit?

**Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, again, what the documents the gentleman is referring to clearly show is that the subjects of this investigation are Senator Duffy and Nigel Wright. Senator Duffy had inappropriate expenses that he should not have claimed, and at the same time, Nigel Wright made repayment of those expenses, and that obviously was not proper.

Of course, the documents also show that the Prime Minister did not know about this, but when he found out on May 15, he immediately went to his office and ordered that the PMO assist the RCMP, providing any and all information they needed. That is a sign of real leadership. That is the type of leadership Canadians have come to depend on from this Prime Minister.

**Mr. Robert Chisholm (Dartmouth—Cole Harbour, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, at some point, the government is going to have to answer questions about undue influence. The list of Conservatives involved in the Mike Duffy affair from the Prime Minister's Office, the Senate, and the party continues to grow, yet few have been reprimanded.

My question to the Prime Minister is, will there be any consequences for Senator Irving Gerstein, from him, for attempting to subvert this audit?

**Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the subjects of the RCMP investigation are Nigel Wright and Senator Duffy. They are the ones who are being investigated for their actions.

The NDP, of course, is trying to cast a wide net over everybody. If he lives by that standard, I guess all 101 members of the NDP caucus should resign, in light of the fact that they accepted \$340,000 in illegal campaign donations from their union friends.



*Oral Questions*

Let us get back to the facts. The fact of the matter is that Senator Duffy accepted expenses that he never should have. Nigel Wright inappropriately repaid those expenses. That is what is being investigated. The Prime Minister's Office is assisting. Had the Prime Minister known, he would have in no way endorsed such a plan.

**Ms. Jinny Jogindera Sims (Newton—North Delta, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, that member gives farcical answers. While Conservatives have orchestrated a cover-up and whitewashed an audit, Canadians are not amused.

The Duffy Deloitte audit stopped as soon as the senator repaid his improper expenses, but RCMP documents show that this was part of a larger plan to end questions into Senator Duffy's residency. Did anyone in the Prime Minister's Office ask Mike Duffy's lawyer to withhold information about his residency from Deloitte?

**Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, what the RCMP documents show is that as soon as the Prime Minister found out about this, he went back to his office, and as it is stated here, Rob Staley, the legal representative of the PMO, "advised my office", that is the RCMP, "that he had clear orders from the Prime Minister to provide complete cooperation with the investigation, and to provide any assistance or documentation the RCMP requested".

PMO employees have all provided privacy waivers through their legal counsel. The PMO has also waived solicitor-client privilege for those emails. That is the type of leadership Canadians want from a Prime Minister. That is what they are getting. At the same time, let us focus on the issue at hand. Senator Duffy made inappropriate expense claims, and Nigel Wright inappropriately paid those back.

• (1130)

**Ms. Jinny Jogindera Sims (Newton—North Delta, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the member does not seem to understand the seriousness of these allegations. We know something was going on within the Prime Minister's Office. We have now seen the emails.

I have another very simple question. Did the Prime Minister know about the plan hatched between Benjamin Perrin, Janice Payne, Senator Tkachuk, and Senator Duffy to pay off Mr. Duffy's improper expenses in order to prevent further investigation by Deloitte?

**Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I just answered that question. The Prime Minister stated that he found out on May 15 that it was Nigel Wright who repaid those expenses. We had all heard earlier that Senator Duffy had used his own resources to pay back those expenses. We know that that was not true and that a different scheme was hatched.

As soon as the Prime Minister found out on May 15, as I have just said, and as stated on page 21 of the report, the Prime Minister took immediate action, showed incredible leadership, and ensured that his office assisted the RCMP to get to the bottom of this.

As we know, had he known about this plan, he would have in no way endorsed such a scheme.

[Translation]

**Mr. Guy Caron (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the RCMP documents show that

Benjamin Perrin, a PMO lawyer, was the primary legal advisor helping the Prime Minister's Office develop the agreement to repay Mike Duffy's illegal claims.

Perrin is a close friend of the Prime Minister. Why did the Prime Minister mislead the House when he said that Perrin was not involved?

[English]

**Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, again, what the RCMP is investigating is the relationship between Senator Duffy and Nigel Wright. That is quite evident in all of the documents the member is referring to.

I would also refer the member to page 21 of the same documents, which show the leadership the Prime Minister took. I would also refer him to page 72, where it is quite clearly stated by the RCMP that the Prime Minister had no knowledge of this agreement between Senator Duffy and Nigel Wright.

[Translation]

**Mr. Guy Caron (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the question was about Benjamin Perrin, but I did not get an answer.

Nigel Wright was fired or resigned—who even knows—because he arranged an agreement to repay Mike Duffy's illegal expenses. Irving Gerstein helped set up this agreement.

Irving Gerstein also tried to manipulate the audit report of the senators' expenses produced by the independent firm Deloitte.

Why are there consequences for Wright but not for Gerstein?

[English]

**Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, again, the reports the member referenced quite clearly indicate that it is Nigel Wright and Senator Duffy who are the subjects of this investigation.

With respect to reports, I think all members of Parliament, on both sides of the House, are routinely given advice by different people. I know that in committee, when we are reviewing reports, political staff sit behind all of us, but ultimately, it is up to the members of Parliament, it is up to those who are elevated to the Senate, to make the decisions and to stand by the decisions they make. That happens every single day in this place, and I suspect it should happen in the Senate, as well.

[Translation]

**Mr. Tarik Brahmī (Saint-Jean, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the RCMP documents have revealed that a scheme involving more than a dozen people, including employees in the Prime Minister's Office, ended with Nigel Wright giving Mike Duffy a cheque.

*Oral Questions*

Do the Conservatives expect us to believe that the Prime Minister had no idea that the amount of claims to be reimbursed went from \$30,000 to \$90,000?

[English]

**Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, again, the documents quite clearly state that the Prime Minister did not know that this plan had been hatched by Nigel Wright and Senator Duffy. At the same time, Nigel Wright, in earlier affidavits, already identified the people he had brought into his confidence with respect to his using his personal resources to repay those inappropriate expenses.

[Translation]

**Mr. Tarik Brahmī (Saint-Jean, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, again according to the RCMP, Conservative employees were afraid that Mike Duffy would hand over his documents. Emails from Nigel Wright and Senator LeBreton indicate that they wanted to avoid having Mike Duffy release documents during the Deloitte audit.

How is it possible that the Prime Minister was never informed of objections raised by employees such as Christopher Montgomery, who was the director of parliamentary affairs in the office of the government leader in the Senate at the time?

• (1135)

[English]

**Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC):** On the contrary, Mr. Speaker. What the documents show, on page 21, is the level of assistance the Prime Minister Office's did offer. Some thousands of emails were turned over with respect to this ongoing RCMP investigation. The Prime Minister was very clear to the PMO that it was to assist in any way possible with respect to the investigation.

I think it is very clear that the Prime Minister showed extraordinary leadership. The moment he found out about this, he ordered his office to completely assist with the RCMP. That is the type of leadership Canadians expect from a prime minister, and that is the type of leadership they get day in and day out from this Prime Minister.

[Translation]

**Ms. Ruth Ellen Brosseau (Berthier—Maskinongé, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, Irving Gerstein knew that Mike Duffy racked up more than \$32,000 in illegal expense claims because he refused to cut a cheque for \$90,000. However, they would have us believe that the Prime Minister knew nothing of it. Everyone knew that Mike Duffy could embarrass the government. Senator LeBreton was afraid of what would be revealed if Mike Duffy handed over his documents.

If the Leader of the Government in the Senate was worried about potential damage, why would she not have told the Prime Minister?

[English]

**Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, as I have said countless times in this House, the Prime Minister was approached by Senator Duffy on February 13, trying to justify his inappropriate expenses. The Prime Minister told him he had to repay

those expenses back and that if he did not, he could not expect the support of this caucus going forward.

We were very concerned with the fact that some senators, including former disgraced Liberal senator Mac Harb, seemed to have defrauded Canadians of hundreds of thousands of dollars. Are we concerned about that? Yes. That is why we moved, and the Senate moved, to suspend these three senators. Unfortunately, the opposition did not support that.

**Hon. John McCallum (Markham—Unionville, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday the parliamentary secretary mused about what the residents of Markham want from their government. I can tell the member that they certainly do not want the Prime Minister's hand-picked, taxpayer-funded lawyer negotiating a backroom deal to hide who was actually paying Mike Duffy's expenses and then deleting all the email evidence afterwards.

Who deleted Mr. Perrin's emails? Who instructed them to do so, and what were they hiding?

**Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, what I said was what the people of Oak Ridges—Markham want. I suspect that is why they sent me to Parliament, to fight on their behalf, with one of the largest vote counts in the entire country, second, of course, only to the member from Calgary.

I note that there are some 42,000 people in my riding who voted for me to come here to represent them. I also note that at the same time, the people of Markham were very clear when they also elected the member for Thornhill. Two out of three is not bad; one more to go.

With respect to Mr. Perrin, of course, there are Treasury Board rules that outline how emails are dealt with when an employee leaves.

**Hon. John McCallum (Markham—Unionville, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, all those people from Oak Ridges—Markham did not send their member here to defend fraud, which is what he is doing today.

[Translation]

Negotiating an agreement with Mr. Duffy is not acceptable conduct from a member of the bar.

Has the government or the Minister of Justice contacted the Law Society of British Columbia and the Law Society of Upper Canada to ask them to investigate Mr. Perrin's professional conduct?

[English]

**Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I thought the hon. gentleman liked me. I am hurt to hear that somehow we have had a change in our relationship. I still like him and of course will show that non-partisan spirit that I have shown in the past.

I suspect the member is just upset because yesterday on *Power & Politics* I said that in fact I am not Hamilton Tiger-Cats fan, I am actually a Saskatchewan Roughriders fan. As one of the members of the GTA, not supporting a GTA team, I suppose he is upset at that.

*Oral Questions*

The reality is that the Saskatchewan Roughriders have great fans. They deserve to have the Grey Cup. I wish them very well and hopefully they will bring home the Grey Cup for Saskatchewan.

**Hon. Ralph Goodale (Wascana, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, one answer in six months.

Police documents show there were conversations between Nigel Wright and the Prime Minister about the Duffy arrangement. If that arrangement did not get a “good to go” from the Prime Minister, is it then the government's position that Nigel Wright lied? Then, what about Chris Woodcock? Did he lie? Did Ben Perrin lie? Did Patrick Rogers? Arthur Hamilton? van Hemmen? Novak? Byrne? MacDougall? Hilton?

Did the entire Conservative fraud squad lie to the Prime Minister? Is that the government's position?

• (1140)

**Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, again, the documents quite clearly show that the Prime Minister did not know that this scheme had been hatched. The Prime Minister has said on a number of occasions that had he known he would have in no way allowed this to happen.

What is also very clear is that as soon as the Prime Minister found out, he went back to his office and ordered the full and complete assistance of his office to the RCMP. Again I contrast that to the leader of the Liberal Party who hid the fact that one of his senators was being investigated for very serious crimes for three months.

When it comes to showing leadership on matters that matter to Canadians, they can always count on this Prime Minister. That is why the leader of the Liberal Party is in way over his head.

**Mr. Jasbir Sandhu (Surrey North, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the people of Surrey are upset about a cover-up hatched in the Prime Minister's own office.

Yesterday we asked why Conservatives broke the law by deleting Benjamin Perrin's email about the cover-up. The parliamentary secretary replied, “we expect all staff to follow those rules”.

This is about erasing evidence. Will the Conservatives now acknowledge rules were broken when Benjamin Perrin's emails were erased?

**Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I would refer the hon. gentleman to Treasury Board Secretariat rules with respect to how emails of employees who are departing offices are dealt with.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Alain Giguère (Marc-Aurèle-Fortin, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister keeps saying that the Prime Minister is prepared to co-operate fully with the RCMP.

If that is the case, why were Benjamin Perrin's emails deleted, as the RCMP report indicates? Is this not precisely an example of a total lack of co-operation?

[*English*]

**Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, there are rules in place. Those rules are set by Parliament and enforced by the Treasury Board Secretariat with respect to how emails of departing employees are handled and managed.

Those are the rules set forth by the Treasury Board Secretariat, and I suspect those rules were all followed.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. José Nunez-Melo (Laval, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, during its investigation, the RCMP was unable to obtain the emails of Benjamin Perrin, the former counsel for the Prime Minister, because they had been deleted.

Therefore, the Prime Minister's Office has not shown full co-operation and Treasury Board rules were not followed.

Will the Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister confirm these two statements?

[*English*]

**Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, this is actually handled by public servants. It is not handled by political staff.

There are Treasury Board Secretariat rules that are in place. They are the ones who manage the process when an employee leaves the office. Those rules were followed. Those rules are undertaken by the Treasury Board Secretariat.

I have answered that three times. He can maybe ask it again and I will answer it exactly the same way. Those are managed by Treasury Board Secretariat, and I suspect the rules were followed.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Jamie Nicholls (Vaudreuil—Soulanges, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, will the parliamentary secretary tell us whether the decision to delete the emails and ignore the rules was made by Benjamin Perrin or another staffer at the Prime Minister's Office? Who deleted the emails?

[*English*]

**Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, as I have said, documents upon the departure of staff are managed according to rules included in the Treasury Board guidelines.

\* \* \*

**PUBLIC SAFETY**

**Mr. Rick Norlock (Northumberland—Quinte West, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Liberal Senator Colin Kenny, a former senior adviser to Pierre Trudeau, is facing some serious accusations. My thoughts are with his former assistant who blew the whistle on his disturbing actions ranging from making special requests about what type of clothes she would wear to work, to even touching her hips when the office door was closed. Shockingly, the Liberal leader's chief of staff knew about these allegations for months before the senator left the Liberal caucus only yesterday.

*Oral Questions*

Could the parliamentary secretary please tell the House what our government has done to crack down on sexual predators?

• (1145)

**Ms. Roxanne James (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, these allegations are incredibly serious. If the Liberal senator is found responsible, he should face the full force of the law. What is also disturbing is that the Liberals' top adviser knew of these allegations for months and did not say anything.

Our government ended house arrest for serious crimes like sexual assault and kidnapping. Unfortunately, but I suppose not surprisingly, the Liberals voted against our efforts to protect women against sexual predators.

Furthermore, the Liberal leader has even mused that he wants to end or repeal mandatory minimum sentences for anyone. Canadians want to know. Is that so his caucus can avoid spending time behind bars?

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS**

**Mr. Romeo Saganash (Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the RCMP documents have revealed the secret strategies used by the Prime Minister's Office to manipulate what happens in the Senate. Nigel Wright and his friends got angry when the Senate dared suggest that the government should make massive investments in first nations education. That is incredible. It is obvious that those guys in their ivory tower have never visited an aboriginal school.

Instead of investing in fraudster senators, when will they invest in first nations education?

[English]

**Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, again, he first referenced the Senate affair and that of course is between Senator Duffy and Nigel Wright.

However, when it comes to investing in aboriginal communities, I think the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs has shown extraordinary leadership on this file. He is working day in and day out. The difference between our side and that side is that we do not just talk about making a difference for aboriginal communities, we work with them to make a real difference in the lives of our aboriginal communities across the country.

[Translation]

**Mr. Romeo Saganash (Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, people on that side tie funding to performance, and aboriginal schools are struggling with chronic underfunding. It makes no sense.

That is why the NDP launched a petition this week to defend the interests of aboriginal children and put an end to chronic underfunding of schools.

Will the minister finally step up and create the conditions that will give all children equal access to education and quality schools?

**Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, if the member is so concerned about first nations children in reserve schools that he feels it necessary to demand they be funded at a fair level that enables them to succeed, he should convince his leader and the members of his party to support the bill on education for first nations children.

For the first time in history, we have a bill before us that will create the conditions to ensure the success of students on reserves, and we are asking the NDP to support our initiative.

[English]

**Ms. Jean Crowder (Nanaimo—Cowichan, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, at the AFN youth summit this week, the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs said he may consider withdrawing the proposed education legislation. B.C. first nation educators have already come out against the Conservative education plan and so have chiefs in Ontario and Quebec.

Why is the minister waiting? He should withdraw his proposal right now. What first nation educators, students and communities want to know is whether the minister will work with them instead of imposing legislation.

**Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, we have been clear that no decision has been made as to whether or not a bill will be tabled. We are in the process of consultation with first nation and provincial stakeholders to determine the best way of ensuring we meet the challenges of youth on reserve.

Again, the NDP would rather dismiss the problem and do nothing, but we believe that by continuing to work with first nations we can achieve positive results.

**Ms. Jean Crowder (Nanaimo—Cowichan, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives' own national panel on elementary and secondary education on reserve said, "education reform must be based on strong, positive...outcomes, not on an average cost per student approach".

They saw the indications of a gap in funding, the lack of equipment, few supports for special needs students and school facilities in disrepair.

The minister can act now to close that gap. Will he commit to providing equitable funding for on-reserve students?

• (1150)

**Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I indicated clearly that currently we have a system where the NDP and the tax-and-spend Liberals would have us throw more money at a problem that is failing the students on reserve year after year. Instead of throwing money at the problem, we are suggesting that we work together to find a solution that will bring about results.

I know the NDP does not care about results, but on this side of the House we do and first nations do.

*Oral Questions***AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY**

**Hon. Judy Sgro (York West, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, despite the hollow pro-consumer rhetoric being sold by the Conservative government, middle-class Canadians headed south for Black Friday would clearly hit roadblocks if a car is on their shopping list.

Automakers are ordering U.S. dealers not to sell to Canadians despite the fact that taxpayers lent them billions of dollars to stay in business. Paying up to \$10,000 more for a car in Canada is nothing short of highway robbery, especially when many of these cars are Canadian made.

When are the Conservatives going to start really fighting for Canadians and do something about this inequity?

**Hon. Gary Goodyear (Minister of State (Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario), CPC):** Mr. Speaker, of course, this government is committed to keeping Canada's automotive industry alive and well, innovative and globally competitive. That is exactly why we recently renewed the automotive innovation fund, which the NDP voted against.

We are working very hard to create high-quality jobs and a globally competitive market. In fact, I want to point out to the member that Canadian sales in August were up 6.5% compared to last year. That is great news for a recovering economy.

**Hon. Judy Sgro (York West, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, they talk big and can say whatever they want, but there is still a \$10,000 disparity. Talk is cheap. We want to see more action done on that file.

The suggested Canadian retail price for a car made in Alliston, Ontario, is \$9,000 more than if that car were bought in the U.S.

Empty words are not going to close this gap. When are consumers going to get real fair trade when it comes to purchasing cars made in Canada?

**Hon. Gary Goodyear (Minister of State (Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario), CPC):** Mr. Speaker, again, every automotive maker in Canada, such as Chrysler, Toyota in my riding, are reporting record sales. They continue to grow. The reason we have such a recovering economy in Ontario is because on this side of the House we continue to reduce taxes for consumers so that they can in fact afford these types of goods.

What is the Liberal solution to this? It is to raise the GST back up like they did before and then generate more tax revenue through the sale of illegal drugs. That is not our position on this side of the House. We are improving—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton):** The hon. member for Longueuil—Pierre-Boucher.

\* \* \*

**CHAMPLAIN BRIDGE**

**Mr. Pierre Nantel (Longueuil—Pierre-Boucher, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, if we want to talk about cars, let us talk about stalled cars.  
[Translation]

Yesterday, The Jacques Cartier and Champlain Bridges Incorporated announced that a second lane on the Champlain Bridge would be closed, after it discovered that the crack that led to the closure of the first lane had gotten worse.

People are worried. There is an increasingly real risk that the Champlain Bridge may not hold up until the new bridge opens in 2021.

Can the government tell us what contingency plans it has if the Champlain Bridge is shut down completely before it is replaced in eight years?

**Mr. Jacques Gourde (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, for Official Languages and for the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the safety of users of the Champlain Bridge remains a priority for the Government of Canada.

That is why we undertook major renovations, injecting \$380 million in maintenance work, to ensure that the existing bridge is safe until the new bridge opens.

**Mr. Pierre Nantel (Longueuil—Pierre-Boucher, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I do not know why, but I am not reassured, and neither are people from the greater Longueuil community.

A lack of planning is exactly how we got to where we are today. Successive governments never thought that the bridge would eventually reach the end of its lifespan and that we would need new bridge before cracks started appearing all over. It is disheartening to see the Conservatives making the same mistakes.

Does the government understand how urgent it is to work with local elected officials and municipalities? It needs to develop a contingency plan as soon as possible in case the Champlain Bridge is shut down completely before 2021.

**Mr. Jacques Gourde (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, for Official Languages and for the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, we do not need lectures from a party that has always opposed investments for repairs. In 2009, 2010 and 2011, the NDP did not want to ensure the safety of the existing structure when it came time to vote on the budget.

\* \* \*

• (1155)

[English]

**STATUS OF WOMEN**

**Mr. David Sweet (Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Westdale, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, child, early and force marriage is a barbaric practice that not only prevents development, but has a devastating effect on the health, education and economy of entire communities. It is a violation of the freedom and human rights of young girls.

What is the Government of Canada doing to fight this terrible practice?

**Mr. David Anderson (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for his great commitment to this issue.

### Oral Questions

Yesterday, Canada made history with the passing of the first ever stand-alone resolution on the issue of child, early and forced marriage at the 68th UN General Assembly. In this resolution, 109 countries joined with us, another important step in our government's efforts to free millions of women and girls from the inhuman practice of early and forced marriage.

This is leadership of which all Canadians can be proud. We will continue to champion human rights around the world. We are not afraid to speak out on these issues for fear of being seen culturally insensitive or politically incorrect. These women and girls deserve the same education and opportunities as everybody else.

\* \* \*

### AIR TRANSPORTATION

**Ms. Yvonne Jones (Labrador, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the inquiry into the tragic Cougar helicopter crash in Newfoundland and Labrador claiming the lives of offshore workers has strongly recommended that the federal government establish a transportation safety board as part of the C-NLOPB.

Today, I ask the government this. Why has it ignored that critical recommendation and failed to act to protect the offshore workers in Newfoundland and Labrador?

**Mr. Jeff Watson (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, of course our thoughts continue to go out to the families of the victims of this tragic accident.

Our government is committed to strengthening aviation safety for all Canadians. Transport Canada reviewed the Transportation Safety Board report and our government has taken action to address the recommendations. Transport Canada worked with industry to develop these new regulations, which will improve the safety of offshore helicopter operations for both passengers and crew.

\* \* \*

### THE ENVIRONMENT

**Mr. Dennis Bevington (Western Arctic, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, this summer the Mackenzie Valley Review Board gave conditional approval for cleanup plans for the old Giant Mine. The Conservative's response has been to reject recommendations on independent reviews, on health and on citizen input.

Giant Mine is the poster child for why we need strong environmental regulations. Buried underground are 237,000 tonnes of arsenic. Why is the minister refusing to take all measures to ensure this poison is never released?

**Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, contrary to what the member alleges, we are currently reviewing the environmental assessment report submitted by the Mackenzie Valley Review Board. We will make a decision that is in the best interests of northerners and all Canadians.

\* \* \*

### MULTICULTURALISM

**Mr. Bob Zimmer (Prince George—Peace River, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, at this time each year Canadians gather in solemn

commemoration of the Holodomor, perpetuated by the Soviet regime on the Ukrainian people 80 years ago.

In 2008, our Parliament passed an act to establish a Holodomor memorial day, and to officially recognize the Ukrainian Famine of 1932 to 1933 as an act of genocide.

Could the Minister of State for Multiculturalism please tell us why it is important that all Canadians remember the atrocities that took place during the Holodomor?

**Hon. Tim Uppal (Minister of State (Multiculturalism), CPC):** Mr. Speaker, on the fourth Saturday of November we join Ukrainian communities across Canada in commemorating Holodomor Memorial Day. Holodomor was a horrific act of genocide carried out by Joseph Stalin's soviet regime through the deliberate starvation of millions of Ukrainians.

Our government has been committed to raising awareness of Holodomor through the establishment of a monument to the victims of communism in Ottawa. We have an obligation to ensure future generations of Canadians learn about and remember the Holodomor. We will always remember them.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### AIR TRANSPORTATION

**Mr. André Bellavance (Richmond—Arthabaska, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, after moving aircraft maintenance away from Montreal, which was against the law and caused the brutal closure of Aveos, Air Canada is continuing its efforts to undermine its Montreal facilities. The company is quietly moving many of its specialized, high-paid positions to Toronto, and the federal government refuses to do a thing about it. After the 100 or so crew scheduling jobs were moved last year, now another 30 or so planning and parts shipping jobs are being relocated to Ontario.

Will the Minister of Transport do something to keep jobs in Montreal, or does she think it is normal for Air Canada's head office in Montreal to become just a post office box?

• (1200)

[English]

**Mrs. Cathy McLeod (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour and for Western Economic Diversification, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the member raises a very good question and we will certainly get back to him as soon as possible.

As a government, our commitment is to the health and safety of all Canadians in all workplaces.

*Routine Proceedings*

[Translation]

**FIREARMS REGISTRY**

**Mr. André Bellavance (Richmond—Arthabaska, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives will do anything to achieve their own ends—they will even mislead Quebeckers and Canadians. After rejecting an RCMP report in 2009 that demonstrated the usefulness of the firearms registry, the Conservatives were even more meanspirited. Under false pretences, they censored a 2012 study that highlighted the benefits of the firearms registry.

How can the Conservatives claim to act in the public interest, when they hide the truth because the facts contradict their ideology? Why will they not simply transfer the data to Quebec, which sees the advantages of having a firearms registry?

[English]

**Ms. Roxanne James (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, we accept the decision of the Supreme Court. We will continue to bring forward measures to keep our streets and communities safe and we will continue to treat law-abiding hunters, farmers and sports shooters with the respect that they deserve.

\* \* \*

**PUBLIC SERVICE OF CANADA**

**Mr. Brent Rathgeber (Edmonton—St. Albert, Ind.):** Mr. Speaker, in 90 minutes the House will debate amendments to Bill C-461 dealing with public sector salary disclosure. For weeks, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister has become quite fond of saying that on that side of the House the Conservatives will always stand up for taxpayers, and I want to put that theory to the test.

Will the government support amendments to Bill C-461, fully supported by the Canadian Taxpayers Federation, to lower the salary disclosure bar for public servants from the ridiculous \$444,761 to a more defensible sum, and that is the salary of a member of Parliament?

**Mr. Bob Dechert (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, let us not forget the NDP and the Liberals voted against this legislation in the first place. In fact, every time we bring forward new measures to increase government transparency, the opposition parties vote against them.

The fact is that all salary ranges for public servants are already disclosed. Our amendments would ensure that information about the top earners in the public service is revealed.

After 13 years of Liberal scandals, we brought forward the Federal Accountability Act. We take no lessons from the opposition parties when it comes to accountable government.

[English]

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS****WAYS AND MEANS**

## NOTICE OF MOTION

**Hon. Tim Uppal (Minister of State (Multiculturalism), CPC):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 83(1) I have the honour to table a notice of a ways and means motion to amend the Customs Tariff Act. Pursuant to Standing Order 83(2) I ask that an order of the day be designated for consideration of the motion.

\* \* \*

**GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS**

**Mr. Tom Lukiwski (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8) I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to three petitions.

\* \* \*

**PETITIONS**

## NAVIGABLE WATERS PROTECTION ACT

**Ms. Jean Crowder (Nanaimo—Cowichan, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I have three petitions to present.

The first petition asks the House to amend the Navigable Waters Protection Act. The Cowichan River on Vancouver Island in B.C. has experienced dangerously low water levels in recent years. The situation poses a significant health risk to salmon stocks. The Cowichan River supplies drinking water and recreation opportunities to thousands of residents.

The petitioners call upon the House of Commons to support Bill C-495 and to reinsert the Cowichan River into the Navigable Waters Protection Act.

●(1205)

## TAXATION

**Ms. Jean Crowder (Nanaimo—Cowichan, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the second petition calls on the Parliament of Canada to support Bill C-201, which would allow tradespersons and indentured apprentices to deduct travel and accommodation expenses from their taxable income so they could secure and maintain employment at a construction site that would be more than 80 kilometres from their home.

That bill was presented by the member for Hamilton Mountain.

## GENETICALLY MODIFIED ALFALFA

**Ms. Jean Crowder (Nanaimo—Cowichan, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, in my final petition, the petitioners call upon Parliament to impose a moratorium on the release of genetically modified alfalfa to allow proper review of the impact on farmers in Canada.

*Government Orders*

## MINING INDUSTRY

**Mr. Frank Valeriote (Guelph, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to table a petition on behalf of my constituents in Guelph on the regulation of Canadian mining companies operating abroad.

The petitioners are concerned about the impact of mining activity on indigenous and non-indigenous communities. Their concerns range from environment destruction, weak environmental assessments, the failure to fully and adequately secure the consent of local communities, complicity in human rights violations and the use of government sanctioned militias as security forces.

The petitioners call on the federal government to implement binding legislation that would regulate the activities of Canadian mining companies overseas to ensure compliance with international human rights standards and promote long-standing Canadian values of respect for the rule of law, good governance and democracy.

\* \* \*

### QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

**Mr. Tom Lukiwski (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the following question will be answered today: Question No. 24.

[Text]

Question No. 24—**Mr. Peter Stoffer:**

With regard to Correctional Service of Canada (CSC): (a) how many adults serving custody sentences in the federal correctional system previously served in the Canadian Forces (CF) and RCMP from 2001 to 2013 inclusive; (b) how many of these adults specified above served their custody sentence in (i) federal minimum security prisons, (ii) federal medium security prisons, (iii) federal maximum security prisons; (c) how many offenders on conditional release previously served in the Canadian Forces and RCMP from 2001 to 2013 inclusive; (d) what is a breakdown on the types of offences committed by adults with previous service in the CF and RCMP for those serving custody sentences in federal correctional facilities and offenders on conditional release from 2001 to 2013 inclusive; (e) has CSC determined a re-conviction rate for adults who previously served in the CF or RCMP from 2001 to 2013 inclusive; (f) what is a breakdown of the types of rehabilitative needs adults who previously served in the CF and RCMP accessed while serving their custody sentence or conditional release (including psychological, social, or occupational training opportunities) from 2001 to 2013 inclusive; and (g) how many adults serving their custody sentence or conditional release with prior CF or RCMP service were treated for Post-traumatic Stress Disorder or Operational Stress Injuries from 2001 to 2013 inclusive?

**Hon. Steven Blaney (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, CSC does not formally track information pertaining to federal offenders who may have served in the Canadian Forces and in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. As a result, a manual case-by-case review would be required in order to accurately respond, and this cannot be completed within the time frame provided.

[English]

**Mr. Tom Lukiwski:** Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton):** Is that agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### DRUG-FREE PRISONS ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-12, An Act to amend the Corrections and Conditional Release Act, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton):** The hon. member for Winnipeg North had sixteen and a half minutes remaining for his remarks, and of course he will have the usual ten minutes for questions and comments.

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Winnipeg North.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to rise to address issues inside the House of Commons, and it is a privilege to do so.

In the legislation we have before us today, I started by talking about the name of the bill and the impression it is attempting to leave with people. I find it difficult to accept it at face value. What is the real motive behind the government bringing forward this legislation?

I represent a wonderful riding, as all MPs no doubt proclaim they do. However, there are many different challenges that our country faces as a nation. One of the greatest challenges we have is related to the issue of addictions. Addictions are very serious. Because we are not aggressively pursuing ways we could deal with that issue in a very proactive way, I believe we are doing a disservice.

Given the very nature and the seriousness of addictions, I believe there is a need for strong federal national leadership to work with the different stakeholders, in particular the provinces, to come up with some solutions to those problems. I do not believe there is anything within this legislation that would do that. It is not addressing the problem of addictions.

I have a great deal of respect for my colleague, the Liberal Party critic for health care. She is exceptionally knowledgeable about the issue of addictions. I have had the opportunity to listen to her on numerous occasions as she has described the issues surrounding addiction.

I am nowhere near as knowledgeable as she is on this addictions file. I want to bring it to the table from a constituency level, from the average person who is working and quite often has a difficult time managing, the middle class. We have not talked enough about the impact that policies and discussions have on our middle class and whether we can do more. I believe we can and we should be doing more.

Bill C-12 is all about addictions and what we are doing for a prisoner who is released from a penitentiary and returning to a public environment. The legislation talks about instituting some requirements, testing to find out whether there is substance abuse prior to release. There will be a lot of debate about that. Whether it is a justice critic or a health critic, both of them will contribute to that aspect of the debate at great length.



*Government Orders*

My frustration is that I do not believe we are doing enough outside of our prisons to deal with this issue. I would challenge the government on that. It needs to take a more holistic approach to dealing with abuse of drugs and the negative consequences.

Our prisons have literally thousands of people who are addicted to drugs or alcohol prior to their entering those institutions. Many would argue that it might even be the cause of them being in those institutions. That is just a small percentage of what is in our communities.

● (1210)

From what I can tell when I look at the legislation, it would do nothing to deal with the issue of addiction. That is what is so disappointing. If the Conservatives are serious, they should develop the necessary programs so that when people are leaving our federal or provincial detention institutions they go into an environment that is going to assist them in staying away from these addictive drugs. I see the consequences and the impact it has on our communities far too often.

We were talking earlier about other legislation regarding safe injection sites. Here is a good example of where government says there is a problem and it is going to attempt to deal with the problem. It is that approach that the Conservatives need to start considering in terms of resolving many different issues that face our society, whether it is in prison or outside of prison.

What has happened in terms of the injection site is to first identify the problem. In prisons, there is a great deal of alcohol and drug abuse. We know that. It is a high percentage. I will go through some of the numbers shortly, but well above 50% of the prison population experience some form of abuse of alcohol, drugs or other chemicals. That abuse does not necessarily originate from within the prison walls. It comes, in most cases I would suggest, from the communities prior to the inmate entering prison. What are we doing in regards to that?

Let us use the example of another piece of legislation. Remember the injection site? Canada has one injection site. That is not something that was thought of out of the blue, to establish it and put it up in Vancouver. That was not the case. There were numerous individuals who recognized that Vancouver had serious issues surrounding addiction and that if they could have a safe injection site they would be able to assist in preventing crimes, assist addicted individuals, and ultimately make a safer community for people to live.

I was very sympathetic to that. I would rather see the paraphernalia that comes with some of these heroin injections in a controlled environment, as opposed to inner city back lanes or schoolyards. It is not just inner city; it even happens in the suburbs. I have seen what I believe were exchanges of drugs in parking lots, which I have been told by constituents to watch out for. There is proper notification that it is prevalent, and not just in the inner cities.

The damage that is caused is horrendous, not only to the individuals who are using the drugs, but also to the environment in which they are injecting these chemicals into their systems. That is not to even mention what might be happening in order for them to acquire the drug itself.

We have these stakeholders who identify an issue and then they work on the problem with the different levels of government, including Ottawa, the Province, the city and different stakeholders. I am suggesting that we need to use that mentality of co-operation in working with the stakeholders, including the provinces, to try to deal with problems.

● (1215)

I would point out that this was a specific problem outside the prison system and we saw a solution. We had great co-operation, and something was put into place as a direct result. In speaking with the critic for health, she took great pride in this. Former Prime Minister Jean Chrétien, and others, as I said the provincial and municipal leaders and many different stakeholders, turned it into a reality. They addressed the problem.

I would suggest that is what we should be doing in dealing with our prisons. We need to identify what the problem truly is. We already have a good sense of that. There have been many reports and many debates.

I do not think anything I am saying this afternoon is earth-shattering. A lot of it is common sense. The people I represent apply common sense to a lot of the issues we have. We might need to start talking a lot more in terms of common sense inside the House of Commons.

We need to start recognizing that there are some simple things, along with some fairly complicated things, that need to happen within our prison systems. It is not just that someone has been found guilty and that because the person has some sort of addiction issue by putting him or her in jail the issue disappears.

If we believe that is the case, we should start talking to some of the correctional officers. These are people on the front line who have not broken any laws. They are protecting our communities and providing a service to all Canadians, even people within the institutions. If we took the time to talk to the correctional officers, they would acknowledge up front that there are serious issues in dealing with drugs and alcohol within our prison system.

I started my comments before question period on this issue about the title of the bill. It makes me wonder why the government has chosen to bring forward the legislation. It is Bill C-12, an act to amend the Corrections and Conditional Release Act. It sounds like a reasonable name for a bill. Of course, the Conservatives brand their legislation. I call it the stamp of approval from the PMO.

The stamp of approval on this piece of legislation is the drug-free prisons act. It builds up this huge expectation and causes a great deal of concern in terms of how the government might attempt to do this.

We probably have stakeholders from around the world who would say it is not possible to make a prison completely drug-free or alcohol-free. It would be interesting to hear witnesses who come before committee provide their input as to why they think that might be possible. We do not think it is.

*Government Orders*

I believe what we want is a government that is proactive or aggressive at dealing with the issues of addiction within our prisons. That is really what we want. I am all for protecting potential future victims from crime. Trust me, I would debate that issue any day with anyone, outside or inside the House. However, I am also interested in debating the issue of substance with regard to drug and alcohol addictions.

• (1220)

If we can come up with programs that are solid and sound and that we can deliver within our prison system, I tell the House that we will have less crime on the streets of our cities and municipalities of all sizes. The challenge is to come up with the right types of programs to make a difference. It might not get us the headlines we want, but it will have a real, tangible impact in terms of decreasing crime in our communities.

That is what I am interested in. That is what the Liberal Party of Canada wants. We want fewer victims, and the best way to achieve that goal is by ensuring that we have programs that will have an impact.

Where, in Bill C-12, is there any movement toward a program that is going to deal with that issue? That is not something we see in the government's legislation. One would ultimately ask, why not? However, the direction the government is taking is moving us away from that.

Again, I will emphasize that I sympathize with and I will fight for victims of crime, but I am also going to fight to prevent victims. With good, strong, healthy programs, we can make a difference. This is something on which the Government of Canada needs to be challenged to start producing, because it has fallen short in providing substantial programs that will make a difference in the communities we live in and represent and make them safer places to be. That is the challenge.

We have the name of the bill. We will see what happens when it goes to committee. I look forward to getting feedback from our health critic and our public safety critic. I look forward to what ultimately happens with the bill.

**Mr. Daryl Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I certainly heard the hon. member's comments, as I have heard many thousands of words of comments in the House over this last while, and I do appreciate his concern and his apparent knowledge on almost everything. However, he mentioned a keyword that I find a little bit disturbing in that I happen to have a great deal of regard for it, and I would hope that he would too. That keyword is common sense.

He said that we must use common sense. Where is the common sense in supplying needles to addicts in a penal institution? Where is the common sense in going to an aboriginal elementary school and promoting the legalization of a controlled substance that is clearly illegal?

• (1225)

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux:** Mr. Speaker, one of the privileges that I have had is the opportunity to serve for about 20 years in the Manitoba legislature. I was afforded the opportunity to play many different roles, such as justice critic, education critic, and health critic

over the years, so I have had the privilege to get a fairly good understanding of the types of policies and issues that affect people on the streets in our communities.

I believe that when I get the opportunity to share that experience with members, it is important that I do so, especially by emphasizing the extent to which Liberals recognize the importance of having proactive, strong, healthy policy. I am talking about policy based on facts and science as opposed to policy based on ideology, which is the only kind of policy the Conservatives tend to develop.

We can use marijuana as an example. We recognize that millions of dollars go to gangs as a direct result of marijuana. If we want to try to fight gang activities, there are other ways that we can look at it. The Conservative government has absolutely failed. The number of people participating in gangs has skyrocketed, and the number continues to grow.

The leader of the Liberal Party comes out with an announcement that is going to take tens of millions of dollars, if not hundreds of millions, out of the pockets of these gangs, but the Conservatives want to support these gangs receiving this illegal money. We are not talking about a few dollars. We are serious about fighting gangs in Canada because they are wreaking havoc in every region of our country.

The key is opening the mind to good, solid policy ideas that are going to make a difference. It could even be Conservatives. We have a Progressive Conservative who—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton):** Questions and comments, the hon. member for Acadie—Bathurst.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Yvon Godin (Acadie—Bathurst, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, let us look at drug related problems. We cannot stick our heads in the sand and pretend they do not exist. British Columbia has clinics where people can go to get their drugs.

It seems as though it is a crime to do that. At least, that is what the Conservative government seems to think.

Does my colleague agree that if we acknowledge the problem, two things could happen? First, we would stop the spread of disease. Second, we could work with these people to help them deal with their problems. That is a possibility.

If we stick our heads in the sand in order to avoid the problem, it will persist. Instead, we must help these people.

[*English*]

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux:** Mr. Speaker, it would be wonderful to see us as a House do a study on the safe injection site and what has happened in Vancouver. If we conducted something of that nature, I believe we would get a really good understanding of many of the consequences and have good, solid policy ideas moving forward.

I want to conclude my remarks by referring back to the whole marijuana issue. That is because I read the story in regard to the Conservative member of Parliament who went to a school and said that he supports legalizing marijuana.

*Government Orders*

I realize that is a bit outside of the PMO bubble, so he is now probably going to be punished as result of making that statement. However, at the end of the day, I suspect that if we canvassed the Conservative members and they were allowed to be outside the PMO bubble, we would find that there are legitimate arguments for it, such as taking millions and millions of dollars away from gangs and using that money to minimize the addiction issues that Canada faces today.

• (1230)

**Mr. Robert Chisholm (Dartmouth—Cole Harbour, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the member's sensitivity on the issue of marijuana, but I would like to get back to the question at hand.

As my colleagues have indicated, we will be supporting the bill moving on to second reading, but we are concerned that this will do very little to actually deal with the problem of drugs in the prison system. In fact, as I think others have said, it shows a lack of action and commitment not unlike what we saw from the Liberal government when it was in power.

There is so much to do and it is so important that we focus our attention. We have talked a lot about the public safety approach that will actually reduce recidivism rates and prevent more victims, and we have talked about other measures that will get to the problem and begin to put some solutions down.

As the member wraps up his time in this debate, would he indicate what kept the Liberals, when they were in government, from moving forward and taking action on this issue, as was the case with so many other issues?

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux:** Mr. Speaker, I do not necessarily agree with the member. After all, this injection site has been highly acclaimed. Even members of his own caucus have recognized that what is happening in Vancouver at InSite shows that it is an excellent program.

That program is a Liberal initiative. When the member says that the Liberal Party did not do anything, all he has to do is talk to the members who have been talking so wonderfully positively, and rightly so, about the InSite program.

Is there a need for more? Absolutely. I would love to see a high number of competing ideas brought forward to the House of Commons. I think we need to do a whole lot more. The Liberal Party critic on health care said to me, "Kevin, we should have this bill going before the health committee, not the public safety committee."

There is a lot of merit in that idea. Why, indeed, is it going to the public safety committee, as opposed to the health committee? The issue of addiction is huge. Maybe we need to have some of those stakeholders from Vancouver come and make a presentation and talk about the success stories of that initiative that Mr. Chrétien and others were involved in a number of years ago.

Let us get a competition of ideas to deal with the issue of addiction. If we do that and we are successful, I would argue that not only will we be saving lives but we will be making the communities we live in safer and better places to be.

**Mr. Daryl Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, today I am going to be sharing my time with the hon. member, a very capable member, I might add, for Medicine Hat.

I rise today as a former police officer and as a person with five institutions in my proximity: Millhaven, the former Kingston Penitentiary, Joyceville, Warkworth, and Pittsburgh. Today I rise with some personal knowledge about the very challenging issue of drugs in federal prisons.

Our government has worked diligently to establish Canada as a country where those who break the law are held accountable for their actions and where the rights of victims are respected. This ensures that we have a strong correctional system that actually rehabilitates prisoners. To this end, we have taken strong action to tackle the problem of drugs in prison, which is, obviously, a significant roadblock to correcting the behaviour of prisoners and to the safety, of course, of correctional officers.

The reality is that prisoners should not have access to illegal drugs or substances while serving their sentences. While the NDP seems to disagree, unfortunately, and would have us provide needles to prisoners, Canadians agree that drugs have absolutely no place behind bars.

The Correctional Service of Canada has a wide range of interdiction measures in place to search out, seize, and detect drugs in institutions, and it has had some successes. However, we can certainly always improve, and that is why our government is drawing a firm line with this bill.

Almost 1,500 drug seizures take place in prisons each year, and more than 1,700 institutional sanctions have been imposed on prisoners for positive drug tests or a refusal to take drug tests. These numbers underscore the drug problem in prisons. It cannot be underestimated. Not only does the sale and use of drugs in prisons adversely affect our chance of correcting criminal behaviour, it certainly poses a threat to the safety of the staff. That is why our government, in its 2011 election platform, made a strong commitment to do even more about this problem.

We set the bar very high when we made three key promises. Number one was that every federal inmate would undergo drug testing once yearly. Is that too much to ask? Number two was that prisoners in possession of illegal substances would face additional and appropriate charges. Is that too much to ask? Number three was that parole applicants who failed these drug tests would be denied parole. They should not be rewarded for illicit, illegal actions.

We have moved forward with these measures to help us achieve these ambitious goals. We have made much progress, particularly with respect to addressing the first two promises.

We have invested heavily in broader interdiction measures. In 2008, we provided \$122 million over five years for interdiction efforts, efforts that included drug detector dogs, security intelligence capacity, and perimeter security. Obviously, institutions are less safe and secure when there are drugs and other contraband, so this has turned out to be a very smart investment.

*Government Orders*

More recently, we complemented this investment with important changes under the Safe Streets and Communities Act that enshrined in law the role of the prisoners' correctional plans. The Safe Streets and Communities Act also introduced two-year mandatory minimum penalties for trafficking drugs in prisons or on prison grounds.

The CSC has recently brought in a number of vital institutional measures that are under way at present. It has increased random monthly urinalysis testing of prisoners. That is amazing. That is one of our most effective detection measures, by the way, and it has increased from 5% to 10%.

CSC is improving data collection on drug use in prisons. It is preparing regulatory amendments to increase fines for inmates possessing or using illicit drugs, with further increases for repeat prisoners. It has also introduced mandatory reporting of all serious incidents of drug possession to the appropriate law enforcement agencies in those jurisdictions.

In an effort to augment CSC's interdiction efforts, Bill C-12, the drug-free prisons act, proposes an important legislative change, another step in our improvement, one that will allow us to fulfill the third of our 2011 platform commitments, which is to deny parole to those prisoners who fail drug tests. We want to provide members of the Parole Board of Canada with additional legislative tools to deny prisoners parole in cases involving failed or refused urinalysis tests. Two changes are required to the Corrections and Conditional Release Act in this regard.

● (1235)

The first is an amendment to add specific authority to cancel parole based on failed or refused urinalysis tests. This means that between the time a prisoner has been granted parole and is released, the CSC would be required to get information on urinalysis to the Parole Board. The Parole Board would then have an opportunity to change or modify its decision and to change or cancel the parole should the new information alter its assessment of the prisoner's risk to the community.

The second is an amendment to include specific authority for the board to impose a special condition requiring the prisoner to abstain from drugs and alcohol. This would apply to prisoners for whom substance abuse had been long identified as the leading factor in that prisoner's criminal behaviour. This would focus the board's attention on this factor, and when the condition was applied, it would create an opportunity for parole to be revoked if the condition was violated.

By striving toward a drug-free environment, we hope to create a number of beneficial outcomes that contribute to successful rehabilitation, that ensure the safety and security of Canadian institutions and communities, and that further support our commitment to hold prisoners accountable for their actions.

We are taking the necessary steps to equip the Correctional Service of Canada and the Parole Board of Canada with the tools they need to tackle drug use in our prisons. We are proud of the substantial progress we have made in respect of our 2011 commitments. We are confident that the drug-free prisons act would take us another step even further down the road in addressing this significant societal problem.

While members of the other parties have pushed for relaxed laws on drugs, on needles in prisons, and promoting drugs in schools to our youth, we will continue with these common-sense measures. Canadians expect absolutely nothing less.

I am thankful for the opportunity today to express what is not only a platform and a party policy but a personal passion. I live and work in the areas where these kinds of illegal activities certainly contribute to the decline of what it means to be a respected Canadian who respects our laws, our challenges, our traditions, and the health and safety of our citizens.

● (1240)

**Mr. Jasbir Sandhu (Surrey North, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the member pointed out in his speech that the government allocated \$122 million back in 2008 for the prison interdiction program. I want to ask what the result of that was, but I know that the member will not respond to that. Therefore, I will give him some facts.

The result was that the prisoners were tested in 2008 and then tested three years later. We spent \$122 million of taxpayer money, but the results showed no difference. The number of prisoners who tested positive for drugs in 2008 was the same in 2011. These facts come from the Correctional Service of Canada itself. I was on the committee that studied drugs in prison, and it was the head of the Correctional Service of Canada who pointed out those figures.

Would the member not agree that spending \$122 million was a waste of taxpayers' money, as it showed no effect on the number of prisoners with drugs in their blood?

**Mr. Daryl Kramp:** Mr. Speaker, the answer is absolutely not. Granted, we have an equivalency. I believe that the rate was roughly 80% 10 years ago and it is roughly 80% now. However, the member is not thinking of the enormous amount of work we have put into identification. We now we have increased urinalysis. We now have sniffer dogs. We have more checks. We have increased areas of scrutiny through the entire system. We have now identified significantly more opportunities for measures where people have been abusing this privilege.

It might be like the member suggesting that if there were a number of police officers on the highway and then we took some of those officers away or left them the same but put another 5,000 vehicles on the highway, there would not be any difference in the level of infractions. That is wrong. The problem is still there. It is huge. The only way we can tackle it is one step and one issue at a time, and this would be a great step forward.

● (1245)

**Mr. Jasbir Sandhu:** Mr. Speaker, as usual, I did not get an answer.

*Government Orders*

The facts are very clear. We spent \$122 million on drug interdiction programs in prison. The result was zero. There was no difference in urinalysis before the money was spent and three years after the money was spent.

We know what works. We heard from experts. We heard from the Correctional Investigator. We heard from many stakeholders throughout the community. The best way to deal with drugs in prison is on the demand side.

There is a law of diminishing returns. We can spend as much money as we want on the interdiction side, but we will not get results for our investment. The best way to deal with what is happening in our prisons is on the prevention side, on the rehabilitation side. However, we have seen long waiting periods for people to get into these programs.

What is the government doing to address the real issue on the demand side? That is what needs to be done. What has the Conservative government done to decrease the wait list for prisoners for the programs that will actually help them?

**Mr. Daryl Kramp:** Mr. Speaker, where I will agree with the hon. member across the way is that this is not a panacea. This will not cure each and every problem we have with illicit drug use in the prisons. However, I can assure the hon. member, from having been there, done that, watched, seen, and worked with these people, that if we eliminate this kind of approach, we are simply acting with one of our hands tied behind our backs.

We need rehabilitation. We need interdiction. We need everything that is there. As I mentioned before, it is not a panacea, but it is one positive step along the way.

I am pleased, quite frankly, that the member's party, and other members of this House, have tentatively agreed to support this bill, in principle, moving forward. They recognize that it is a move that would make a difference. For that, we thank them, and we look forward to continued support as this bill moves through the House.

**Mr. LaVar Payne (Medicine Hat, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Prince Edward—Hastings for his insight into this important bill. As the chair of the public safety committee, he has some very important views to add and his comments earlier, being a former police officer.

It is a pleasure to have an opportunity to speak about this issue of grave concern to our Conservative government and to all Canadians: the use of drugs in our federal prisons.

As hon. members know, our government has a robust agenda in place to strengthen the laws so offenders are held accountable for their actions and to increase the voice of victims in the criminal justice system. To this end, since 2006 we have supported significant crime prevention programs and invested in a wide range of support services for victims of crimes and passed laws to ensure that sentences match the severity of the crime. We have also committed to bringing forward legislation and a victims bill of rights that would enshrine the rights of victims in law. The legislation before us, the drug-free prisons act, would build on this work.

Notably, it brings back to us one of the key parts of our crime and public safety agenda; that of increasing offender accountability. This

push to hold offenders accountable for their crimes forms the basis of much of our correctional programming. This is apparent in the many bills we have introduced and passed.

Offender accountability is a prominent feature in many elements of the Safe Streets and Communities Act, which received royal assent in March 2012. In that comprehensive bill, our government made a number of changes to increase penalties and to place the onus on offenders to succeed in their own rehabilitation and reintegration into the community.

We introduced measures ensuring violent and repeat youth offenders would be held accountable for their actions and that the protection of society would be of paramount consideration.

We ended the use of house arrest and conditional sentences for those offenders convicted of serious and violent crimes. We made it the law that federal offenders would have expectations for their behaviours and objectives for meeting court ordered obligations, such as restitution to victims or child support.

We modernized the disciplinary system, creating new offences for offenders who had disrespectful and intimidating behaviours toward correctional staff.

We made certain that if authorized to be outside of an institution before the end of their sentence, offenders would be expected to continue on the right path. We did this by providing police officers with the power of arrest without warrant of an offender who appeared to be in breach of any condition related to the condition of his or her release.

We made it the law that offenders who received a new custodial sentence would automatically have their parole or statutory release suspended.

We changed the laws so those who committed serious crimes, like sexual offences related to a minor, would be no longer eligible to apply for a record suspension.

We ensured that the Parole Board of Canada could proceed with a parole review, even if the offender requested to withdraw his or her application within 14 days without a valid reason, thereby ensuring that the process would be serious and respectful of victims who planned to attend the hearing.

These are common sense measures that Canadians want and commitments that we are delivering on.

In the last session, a private member's bill put forward by my hon. colleague, the member for Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry, was introduced to ensure that offenders would be held responsible for paying their debts to creditors, such as victims with restitution orders, when they received payment from the Crown.

We recently saw the coming into force of the Increasing Offenders' Accountability for Victims Act which would double the victims' surcharge that offenders must pay and would ensure that the surcharge was automatically applied in all cases.

It is clear that we have made progress in increasing offender accountability for a wide range of crimes and in a wide range of situations.

*Government Orders*

The importance of offender accountability applies equally to the topic at hand: drug use in federal prisons. Our government has taken decisive steps to remove drugs from our federal penitentiaries. In 2007, the Correctional Service Canada, or CSC, adopted a transformation agenda to address areas of concern within our correctional system. Among those areas was that of eliminating drugs from institutions. A consistent national approach was implemented to manage who and what was entering our institutions. New search and surveillance technology, including additional drug protection dog teams, allows for better screening and detection.

• (1250)

Furthermore, the national anti-drug strategy of CSC works within a zero tolerance policy that takes a multi-prong approach to tackling drug and alcohol use, including urine testing, administrative consequences and disciplinary actions.

In particular, urinalysis has been a key focus of the CSC and plays a role in the legislation before us. The use of random and required urine testing is seen as a critical tool in an institutional setting. It holds offenders to account, providing a strong deterrent to drug use.

Of course there are well-defined circumstances in which the CSC can use these tests. First, there are the reasonable grounds for testing, such as finding drugs or drug paraphernalia in a cell. Second, the offender must undergo drug testing in order to participate in a particular institutional program. Third, it is part of a random drug testing program used by the CSC.

Random testing is both fair and effective and an excellent method to helping keep offenders accountable for their actions in prison. The test is random and an inmate who is using drugs cannot plan ahead to ensure he or she is clean the day of the test. Furthermore, if offenders refuse to take the test, they can be subject to the same sanctions or infractions they would receive if they had failed the test.

CSC has recently increased its random monthly testing to help ensure every offender is tested every year and now tests 10% of the offender population every month, up from 5%. With this increase in random testing, the CSC will have more information at its fingertips to monitor an offender's progress and to measure our efforts to create penitentiaries free of drugs.

The legislation before us proposes two amendments to the Corrections and Conditional Release Act, which will empower the CSC and the Parole Board of Canada to use this urine test data to ensure offenders are held to account. Bill C-12 would stipulate in law that the Parole Board could cancel an offender's parole if the offender failed the test or refused to take a urine test in the same period between being granted parole and physically leaving the penitentiary. It would also emphasize in law the Parole Board's ability to set specific abstinence conditions on offenders as part of their parole conditions. Any evidence of drug use could result in the Parole Board cancelling an offender's parole.

We believe these are reasonable expectations of offenders to take responsibility for their actions and be held accountable for those actions. We believe this legislation can help us create a safer environment in our prisons. While many members seem to support more drugs in prisons, Canadians are not fooled. Canadians elected a Conservative majority government that was tough on crime, and we

will crack down on drugs in our communities. That is exactly what we are doing, and we will continue to do that.

• (1255)

**Mr. Jasbir Sandhu (Surrey North, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, it perplexes me when members in the House say that there are many members who want more drugs in our prisons. It just amazes me where that comes from. It is very clear from our side that the best way to reduce drugs in our prisons is to have programs in place, such as rehabilitation and addiction programs, for all prisoners and access to those programs.

The member pointed out that when prisoners are caught with needles, or some form of drug, they will be put into a drug rehab program. There are 2,400 prisoners waiting right now to get into these programs. Does the member believe we should have more money allocated to a drug rehabilitation program?

**Mr. LaVar Payne:** Mr. Speaker, it is interesting because we have heard members from the opposite side propose providing safe needles in prisons. Somehow that does not fit with trying to ensure that prisoners do not have drugs. I have a really hard time understanding how that can help prisoners.

I believe we need to provide as much as we can in terms of rehabilitation, but there is another piece to that. That piece is individuals have responsibility for themselves, for their own actions. They need to ensure they take those actions, get rid of the drugs, stop using them and start performing in the way we expect our citizens of Canada to perform.

**Ms. Roxanne James (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for the good work he does in committee.

In my speech earlier today I talked about the number of drug seizures within our federal penitentiaries. It may have surprised someone listening for the first time to this subject. At the same time, Correctional Services Canada has acknowledged that about 80% of federal inmates have a substance abuse problem.

The NDP plan, enabling drug users to continue using drugs by giving them needles, is not the way to go.

How do these illegal substances, these drugs, get into the prisons in the first place? I think that is something Canadians would like to know.

**Mr. LaVar Payne:** Mr. Speaker, the public service committee did a great job and I believe the parliamentary secretary is very much in support of this legislation.

*Government Orders*

I find it interesting that there are numerous ways that drugs get into our prisons. I have a prison in my riding, which I toured not long ago. I talked with correctional officers who try to ensure drugs do not get into prisons.

However, there are very ingenious ways that these things happen. For example, prisoners go out to an open area. They have their colleagues put drugs inside tennis balls and throw them over the wall. The prisoners then have a tennis ball to play with and then use the drugs afterward. That is one very interesting way that happens, and I was totally surprised. Our corrections officers certainly were aware of that and took the appropriate actions.

• (1300)

**Mr. Daryl Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, earlier on I heard a comment from my hon. colleague from Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, a gentleman I admire and respect. He is the co-chair of public safety committee, which I chair.

What he said about the whole thing, in essence, was, that he thought the NDP members would support the bill, that they did not really have a lot of objection to it, but they did not like the name of the bill. My goodness, if that is not a serious situation to deal with.

I recognize the hon. member as one of the strongest constituency members in Canada. He has the pulse of his community. What do his people really think of the bill?

**Mr. LaVar Payne:** Mr. Speaker, people in my riding are very upset with the amount of drugs out there. When we talk to them about drugs in prisons in particular, they have a hard time believing that is possible. However, once we explain the process of how the drugs get into the prisons, they are extremely upset and they want us to crack down.

As far as the name of the bill, I fully support it.

**Mr. Jasbir Sandhu (Surrey North, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, before I begin my speech I want to take the liberty of answering the question that was posed by a Conservative member to another Conservative member.

The bottom line here is that no one in the House wants to see drugs inside or outside of prisons. That is the reality.

There is an economic law called the “law of diminishing returns”. At a certain point, if enough money is spent on a particular investment, the return is less than the money spent on it, so one has to look at other ways to allocate that funding.

I am talking about the \$122 million that the government allocated for the prevention of drugs in prison. The result of that \$122 million, and I want Canadians to know because this is taxpayers' money, was zero. Basically the Conservatives put some gimmicks in place to prevent drugs from coming into the prisons. There were ion machines that gave false positives a higher than usual number of times. There were sniffer dogs and other gimmicks that the Conservatives brought in.

However, the result of that \$122 million that we spent on preventing drugs from getting into prisons was zero. There was a zero result, which the head of correctional services, Don Head, pointed out in a study done a year ago by the committee. He pointed out that the urinalysis rate of prisoners' testing positive for drugs in

the prison system before the \$122 million was spent was the same rate as after three years.

In other words, it did not reduce the number of people taking drugs in the prison system. What it did do was shortchange taxpayers in the amount of \$122 million.

That is the supply side when I talk about the “law of diminishing returns”, and it is maxed out. We spent an extra \$122 million trying to prevent drugs from getting into the prisons, and it did not have any effect.

However, we have a waiting list on the other side of the economics. I know my friends do not believe in facts and figures. In fact, the member for Newton—North Delta often points out the Conservatives are allergic to data, research and facts.

The facts are that if we look at the demand side in prisons, we have a waiting list of 2,400 prisoners waiting to be treated. They want to get into a program. They want to rehabilitate. They want to get rid of the addiction they have so they can move into our communities and live a normal life.

What does corrections mean? Corrections means that we correct our behaviour. We correct the behaviour in prison. When people commit crimes, they go to prison and become part of a captive audience. Believe it or not these people are going to return to our communities. How can the government make sure these people are able to integrate into our communities? It could provide those rehabilitation services and apprenticeship opportunities, so when the prisoners get out into our communities they are better able to integrate into our society. That is how it works. That is the demand side of it.

On the demand side of the equation, we need to reduce the demand of people wanting to take drugs. The best way to do that is to treat the people who are taking drugs. We were able to spend \$122 million on the interdiction side, which showed no result, yet we are cutting programs that have shown to be effective.

• (1305)

The corrections investigation officer has, time after time, pointed out that we need additional funds and resources to provide services to people who want to be rehabilitated. We have experts from our communities. There have been many peer studies done around the world that very clearly point out that we also need to work on the demand side to reduce drugs in prisons. However, facts, figures and research do not really work with the Conservatives.

Earlier today, one of the members from the Conservative side pointed out that some members somehow want drugs in our prisons, or they do not care how many drugs are in prisons. That is absolutely incorrect. I am perplexed. I do not usually get mad, but I do not think there are any members in the chamber who want more drugs, let alone in prisons. We do not want any drugs in our society.

How do we deal with it? The best way to deal with it is by helping those individuals who have addictions.

*Government Orders*

We heard the figures earlier; 80% of the people coming into our prisons have some sort of drug or alcohol addiction. That tells me that there are not enough resources in our communities to help these people and to get them off drugs and alcohol. If we can do that in our communities before they commit crimes, we would not have victims. We would be helping them by eliminating the victim side of it.

The member also talked about how we are going to bring in a charter for victims and help them. I have been in this place for two and a half years. I have not seen a single piece of legislation from the other side of the House to help victims.

The Conservatives will talk about the veterans and how they are the champions for veterans' rights. I know of a number of cases in my own constituency and I hear from veterans across the country that the government has failed. These are our heroes. These are people who have served our country. These are the people who have given us the right to speak here and outside the House in a free and democratic society.

Going back to the bill, I look at the title, the drug-free prisons act. The correctional investigation officer wants zero tolerance for drugs in prisons. I agree with that. We should strive to do our best, but that is an aspiration. It is not the reality in our society.

We talk about spending \$122 million on the interdiction of drugs in prisons. We have seen no results. The results that the experts have given us are from the rehabilitation and prevention side. That is where the results are. That is where we can still have economies of scale. We can get more prisoners off drugs. Those are real facts. That is science. Those are economic models.

The Conservatives will tell us that they are great economic managers, but they have been in government for seven years. In seven years, how many surplus budgets have they had? Can someone tell me from the Conservative side how many surplus budgets they have had? They have all gone quiet, because they have had none. The budgets have all been deficits. Not only that, the Conservatives have had the largest deficit for any government in the history of our country, yet they call themselves good managers of our money.

● (1310)

Here is another example. When the Conservatives formed government, we had \$26 billion in a current account trade surplus. Under their management we have somehow turned a \$26 billion surplus into a \$62 billion deficit. That is their record.

When we are talking about real records, facts and figures, science and economics, economics tells us that the \$122 million did not have the impact that the government was hoping for. We, along with experts, were telling the Conservatives that they needed to spend money on the other side.

Going back to the title of the bill, this is just like the title for Bill C-2 with regard to InSite in Vancouver, making our communities safe. Their talking points are that they want to hear from the communities when this is decided. In 2003, when InSite was being put in place, the community decided. The City of Vancouver met with stakeholders, whether they were public safety officials, police officers, public health officials, medical officers, doctors, nurses or community organizers, and they came up with a plan to set up InSite

in Vancouver. It has been highly successful in regard to reducing crime rates and reducing needles in the area.

Conservatives say the opposition parties want the needles out in the community or that we want our kids to have access to these needles. That is not true. In fact, the needles that were in the alleys and in front of businesses are no longer there. That has been reduced because of InSite, which was put in place to deal with heroin addicts in Vancouver.

A process was in place that was working well. However, what do the Conservatives do? They said they want to consult the community. In 2008, they took it to the court in B.C. and then to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court clearly told them that under the charter people have the right to access these particular services. Well, we know the Conservative ideology. They were not satisfied with the Supreme Court decision. What did they do? They came up with this fancy name that the bill is protecting our communities, yet it does exactly the opposite.

It is the same with Bill C-12, the drug-free prisons act. There is nothing in the act that gives facts and figures or how it is going to reduce drugs in our prisons. In fact, Bill C-12 basically adds a provision to the Corrections and Conditional Release Act that makes it clear that the Parole Board may use positive results from urine tests or refusals to take urine tests for drugs in making decisions on parole eligibility.

This gives clear authority to an existing practice of the Parole Board, which we support. In other words, the practice is already in place if a prisoner has a positive test for drugs, that information is taken into consideration by the Parole Board before parole eligibility is decided.

Bill C-12 has a misleading title, "drug-free prisons act". Maybe the Conservatives are hoping to send a letter to their base or maybe they have already, because they did that when C-2 came to the House. They fired off a letter to their Conservative base asking for money based on how they were protecting the community. In fact, it was exactly the opposite. The bill does not protect the community. It puts roadblocks for communities to make local decisions. The bill is basically Ottawa telling our municipalities what they can or cannot do in their neighbourhoods. The communities can decide for themselves.

● (1315)

I do not see any facts or figures for some sort of program or plan that would show us how this measure would make our prisons drug-free.

I would certainly like that, but I am also pragmatic. We have had laws for hundreds of years prohibiting drugs in our society. The United States raised a war on drugs and said they were going to get rid of them. Did they get rid of them?

We have spent billions of dollars trying to. There are the times when we have to keep going back to this law of diminishing returns.



*Government Orders*

However, we have to look at the other side, which I have also talked about. That is the rehabilitation side, but there are shortages of space for people who want to get into these programs. The title of the bill has nothing to do with trying to make our prisons safer and rehabilitating and correcting the behaviour of prisoners.

Bill C-12 has a misleading title, as the bill would do little to eliminate all drugs from our federal prison system. An investment in rehabilitation is required if we are serious about rehabilitating prisoners and integrating them back into the community.

I think all people in this House believe that the prison sentence has to fit the crime. There is no doubt that if somebody commits a crime, we put him or in prison. I think all Canadians agree with that. The bottom line is that in two years, three years, four years, 10 years, or whatever the sentence is, these people are going to come back into our communities, so how do we deal with them?

Well, we try to rehabilitate them. We try to correct them in our system. They are a captive audience, and we have seen that when people have taken programs in prison, the recidivism rate for those individuals goes down quite low. Would it not make sense for the Conservatives to provide those resources, instead of wasting money on fancy titles for a bill or sending letters out to their base saying that they are actually doing something here and asking for money?

That is wrong. It is not going to help us in the long run.

The NDP has been very steadfast in its support for measures that would make our prisons safe, while Conservative governments have ignored recommendations from correctional staff and the Correctional Investigator that would decrease violence, gang activity, and drugs in our prisons.

I have had the chance to visit a number of prisons. I had the chance to visit a couple of prisons in Kingston. I had a chance to visit prisons in British Columbia, my province. I visited Kent prison and I also visited Matsqui prison. I talked to the prisoners. I talked to the correctional staff. Overwhelmingly, the response from those individuals was that, first, they do not have enough rehabilitation programs to rehabilitate the drug addict. In addition, money for apprenticeship programs is being cut.

To sum up, we certainly need more investment. There is a long list of people who are waiting to get into drug rehabilitation programs. That is the correct way to go forward: to prevent these individuals coming into our communities without any treatment in the correctional system.

New Democrats will support the bill at this stage, but the title does not reflect the true intent of this bill.

• (1320)

**Ms. Roxanne James (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I listened to the speech by my colleague from the NDP and I lost count of how many times he said “I am perplexed”. After listening to his speech, I think most people in the House are probably perplexed at what he was trying to get to.

He mentioned multiple times that he would certainly like to see drug-free prisons and that he does not know why Conservatives keep saying that the NDP is not as tough on crime as Conservatives are. I

am not sure if he realizes it, but he actually sits in the NDP caucus, and it is that party that wants to establish a needle exchange program in our prisons. Common sense dictates that if we want to get people off drugs, we should not give them the tools that enable them to continue doing drugs. We want to crack down, remove the drugs from prisons, and make sure they are not getting in there in the first place.

I am wondering whether the member opposite thinks we should be giving prisoners needles to enable them to do drugs or whether he believes that he should be sitting on this side of the House and supporting drug-free prisons.

**Mr. Jasbir Sandhu:** Mr. Speaker, I will not be sitting on that side of the House, you can be assured of that. I will be sitting with my colleagues in 2015 on that side of the House, but not with those members.

I do not get perplexed very often, but I am perplexed, and I will tell everyone why. After Conservatives spent \$122 million of Canadian taxpayers' money, I and people in my community are perplexed because they have wasted \$122 million and have no data to show that the number of drug addicts in our prisons has been reduced or that the drug level in prisons has gone down. New Democrats have proposed to look at the demand side, where there are 2,400 prisoners waiting to be rehabilitated, yet the government has not invested in that side of the equation.

Yes, I am perplexed, but again, that is because the Conservatives have wasted \$122 million of Canadian taxpayers' money.

**Ms. Jean Crowder (Nanaimo—Cowichan, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for Surrey North for that very good speech, but I am going to add to his perplexity.

On the one hand, the Conservatives say they are opposed to the trafficking of women, girls, and boys in this country, yet yesterday we learned that Status of Women Canada has stopped the funding for a shelter in Edmonton that dealt specifically with women and girls who were being trafficked. The Conservative government is claiming that it is aiming for a zero tolerance, drug-free policy in prison, yet on the other hand it does not invest in rehabilitation and treatment.

A zero tolerance stance to drugs in prison is an aspiration rather than an effective policy. I want to quote the report from the Office of the Correctional Investigator for 2011-2012, which stated:

A “zero-tolerance” stance to drugs in prison...simply does not accord with the facts of crime and addiction in Canada or elsewhere in the world. Harm reduction measures within a public health and treatment orientation offer a far more promising, cost-effective and sustainable approach to reducing subsequent crime and victimization.

I wonder if the member for Surrey North could comment on that.

• (1325)

**Mr. Jasbir Sandhu:** Mr. Speaker, that is a wonderful question.

I was in the committee meeting when the Correctional Investigator pointed out that facts and figures show that we need to spend additional amounts on the rehabilitation side.

*Private Members' Business*

I am going to quote the member for Newton—North Delta. She always says that Conservatives are allergic to facts, research, and science, and I have to agree with her, because when New Democrats bring up facts and figures, the Conservatives go on rants that have nothing to do with the question we are putting together. If they wanted to have a real debate, they would present some facts and figures.

I am presenting some facts and figures for them. They spent \$122 million of Canadian taxpayers' money with no results. While I am at it, \$3.1 billion is missing from the Treasury Board. That was before the summer, and we have not seen the Treasury Board president stand in the House to tell us whether he found the money during the summer or if he is still looking for it.

**Mr. Robert Chisholm (Dartmouth—Cole Harbour, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I have noted the interest the folks opposite have with the idea of cracking down on illegal drugs in prisons and elsewhere, and I commend them for that. I think it is extremely important. However, with the bill before us particularly, we have been talking about the fact that it would not do what they say it would do. As my colleague pointed out in his speech, the Conservatives spent in excess of \$120 million and got no results in trying to stop it.

Frankly, I am perplexed about the stated commitment that the Conservative government has in trying to stop illegal drug use and trade. We have one of the most prominent political leaders in this country, the mayor of Toronto, who has admitted to smoking crack, purchasing crack and using other drugs such as marijuana and others, but we have not heard a peep out of the members opposite. Would the member not agree that it is perplexing?

**Mr. Jasbir Sandhu:** Mr. Speaker, maybe I am not quite as perplexed with that question. The fellow he is talking about is the Prime Minister's fishing buddy.

We talk about reducing drugs in our prisons, yet here is a Conservative friend and donor who has openly admitted to using crack. Here is the mayor of Toronto who has admitted to using drugs, hangs out with drug dealers, yet we have not heard anything from the Prime Minister regarding how he views this particular mayor and how it is affecting Torontonians in their day-to-day business. Is this costing them money? I have heard a number of reports.

The Conservatives have one set of guidelines and rules for the general public, but they have another set for their friends and Conservatives.

**Ms. Jinny Jogindera Sims (Newton—North Delta, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, all evidence and research shows us that we cannot tackle the drug situation in this country just through incarceration and punishment. We need to invest in rehabilitation and treatment. Would the member for Surrey North agree?

**Mr. Jasbir Sandhu:** Mr. Speaker, I want Canadians to know that these prisoners will get out of prison one day or another. It is the responsibility of the government to make sure that when they come out of prison they are rehabilitated.

We have seen from the facts that there are 2,400 prisoners waiting to get into rehabilitation programs, yet the government is spending \$122 million trying to prevent drugs coming into prisons, which has not worked.

On this side of the House, we want prisoners to be rehabilitated. We want programs in place in prisons so that when prisoners do come out they are able to reintegrate into society very easily.

● (1330)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton):** The hon. member for Surrey North will, I am sure, be interested to know that he has one minute remaining in the time for questions and comments, should he wish it, when the House next resumes debate on the question.

It being 1:30 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper.

---

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

### CBC AND PUBLIC SERVICE DISCLOSURE AND TRANSPARENCY ACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-461, An Act to amend the Access to Information Act and the Privacy Act (disclosure of information), as reported (with amendments) from the committee.

[*English*]

#### SPEAKER'S RULING

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton):** There are eight motions in amendment standing on the notice paper for the report stage of Bill C-461. Motions Nos. 1 to 8 will be grouped for debate and voted upon according to the voting pattern available at the table.

● (1335)

#### MOTIONS IN AMENDMENT

**Mr. Brent Rathgeber (Edmonton—St. Albert, Ind.)**, seconded by the member for Winnipeg North, moved:

Motion No. 1

That Bill C-461 be amended by replacing the long title on page 1 with the following:

“An Act to amend the Privacy Act (disclosure of information)”

Motion No. 2

That Bill C-461, in the short title, be amended by replacing line 4 on page 1 with the following:

“1. This Act may be cited as the”

Motion No. 3

That Bill C-461 be amended by deleting clause 2.

Motion No. 4

That Bill C-461 be amended by deleting Clause 3.

Motion No. 5

That Bill C-461, in Clause 4, be amended by replacing lines 4 to 20 on page 2 with the following:

“(iii) the total annual monetary income of the individual, including any performance bonus, as well as the job classification and responsibilities of the position held by the individual, and any additional responsibilities given to the individual, if that income is equal to or greater than the sessional allowance—within the meaning of the Parliament of Canada Act—payable to a member of Parliament,

(iii.1) the salary range of the position held by the individual, as well as the classification and responsibilities of that position, if the individual's total annual monetary income, including any performance bonus, is less than the sessional allowance—within the meaning of the Parliament of Canada Act—payable to a member of Parliament,

(iii.2) the expenses incurred by the individual in the course of employment for which the individual has been reimbursed by the government institution.”

Motion No. 6

That Bill C-461 be amended by deleting clause 5.

Motion No. 7

That Bill C-461 be amended by deleting clause 6.

Motion No. 8

That Bill C-461 be amended by deleting clause 7.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to speak to the amendments that you have just deemed to be admissible with respect to the report stage of Bill C-461 dealing with public sector transparency.

The bill, in its original form, is intended to do two fairly modest things. It attempted to remedy a well-documented and often litigated flaw in the Access to Information Act regarding the public broadcaster. Section 68.1 has been the matter of no less than 14 separate pieces of litigation between the information officer and the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

Both the Federal Court and the Federal Court of Appeal found that section 68.1 of the Access to Information Act, brought in by the Conservative government in 2006, is flawed in its drafting because it creates an exclusion subject to an exception. Section 68.1, and I am paraphrasing, says that the freedom of information act does not apply to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation in terms of its documents and information that relate to its journalistic, creative or programming activities, other than information that relates to its general administration.

We can see the problem. It creates an exclusion where the act does not apply except under certain circumstances, in other words, matters regarding general administration.

In my view, and in fairly well-documented examples, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation was able to use section 68.1 to deny the disclosure of documents that were under access request. The fact that the act did not apply indicated there was no power of review from the Information Commissioner. The Information Commissioner gets her powers of review from the act, so if the act does not apply there is no power of review.

This bill, in its original form, attempted to remedy this. It attempted to remedy what two federal courts indicated was not a model of clarity and was very awkward in its drafting.

The Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics did a complete study on section 68.1 because there was so much controversy and misunderstanding. There were also 14 pieces of litigation between the information commission and the CBC.

The committee heard testimony. The Information Commissioner, Ms. Legault, testified in front of the standing committee on access. She recommended that section 68.1 be repealed and that it be replaced with an injury-based exemption, not an exclusion. It would be discretionary, so that if the test was made that the CBC would somehow be injured in terms of its independence, she would recommend against disclosure. However, if there was no prejudice or injury, she would recommend that the documents be disclosed.

### *Private Members' Business*

It all seemed perfectly reasonable at the time, and that recommendation was incorporated in the original version of Bill C-461.

We heard evidence at the committee, and we had a number of hearings. I am not a member of the committee, but I sat through them as an interested member and as the sponsor of the bill. We heard cogent evidence that the independence test was too narrow. It created a level of discomfort within both the broadcast industry and the public broadcaster that the independence test was too narrow and it might be expanded to include something similar, to protect not only the independence but the freedom of expression of the corporation.

I conceded at the last of my three witness appearances before the committee that it would be helpful. Wording to protect not only the independence of the corporation but also its freedom of expression would be helpful, and it would give a greater level of comfort to both the industry and the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. However, the committee, or at least the majority of the committee, was disinclined to accept that type of recommendation, so it was not passed.

The committee did pass a most unhelpful amendment regarding journalistic source protection. The House will recall that the problem with section 68.1, as it still is in the act and in law today, is the exclusion at the beginning with the words “This Act does not apply..”.

What did the government do to amend it at committee? It granted another exclusion. It provided an absolute exclusion for journalistic source privilege. It recommended the wording “This Act does not apply..”, which means that the Information Commissioner has no powers of review. Therefore, decisions of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation with respect to journalistic source privilege are absolute and not subject to review by the Information Commissioner.

● (1340)

The inevitable result of that untenable situation is litigation. The Information Commissioner said as much when she appeared before committee. If her powers of review are compromised, she would have to go to court to get clarification of those powers because section 36 of the act gives her unfettered power to review documents under the control of government institutions.

The government, in its so-called wisdom, proposed the exact same problem that we just set out to remedy, which was that we were replacing the exclusion in section 68.1 with a discretionary exemption. Then government members went ahead in their amendments at committee to provide an exclusion with respect to journalistic source privilege.

I believe, and I say this with some regret, that the bill as amended by the access committee is actually worse than the status quo, the existing provisions regarding the Access to Information Act.

My intent was to provide clarity and certainty, and to have less litigation rather than more litigation. The government refused to entertain amendments regarding extending the discretionary exemption to include freedom of expression, in addition to its insistence that an absolute exclusion be given with respect to journalistic source privilege. I think that makes this a bad piece of legislation with respect to the CBC access.

*Private Members' Business*

In the motions that have been tabled, I am proposing the deletion of any reference to access to information regarding the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, including the name of the bill. Motions Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7 and 8 deal with the deletion of sections regarding the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation's obligations under the Access to Information Act.

I still believe that section 68.1 needs to be fixed because it is awkwardly drafted. The courts have called it “not a model of clarity”. When there is an exclusion and then the exclusion is limited with an exception, we would have nothing but misunderstanding and litigation. It has to be fixed, but the bill in its current form does not fix it. In fact, in my view it makes it worse.

With respect to journalistic source privilege, I absolutely understand the importance of allowing journalists to protect their confidential sources. The Information Commissioner has had 1,200 cases before her, and not one has ever dealt with journalistic source privilege. As well, the name of an informant is confidential information under the Privacy Act and could not be disclosed. The CBC amendments at committee were most unhelpful.

With my remaining time, I want to deal with what I think is the most contentious issue, and that is with respect to salary disclosure. The bill attempts to allow an amendment to the Privacy Act to allow specific salary and job description disclosure for a civil servant over an appropriate range. The range in the unamended act was for the lowest level of DM1, or \$188,000. However, the committee in its wisdom, and I say that with more sarcasm than I have ever used in my life, decided to raise the disclosure bar to \$444,000 to ensure it could not apply to any DM, including a DM4, or anybody below him or her.

I am not sure how the government reconciles that with Treasury Board proactive disclosure. If an individual has a contract with the Government of Canada for as little as \$10,000, their name, their contract and the value of their contract is on a Treasury Board website. However, if the individual is a deputy minister making \$444,000, apparently the privacy laws of Canada are made to protect them.

The nub of this issue, in my view, is the performance bonus. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice will get up and talk about already disclosing ranges of salary. That is true. However, a DM4 is the highest level. The range is \$272,000 to \$319,000, and that is a pretty big range. That is almost \$50,000.

However, that does not end it. A deputy minister at that level is entitled to up to a 39% discretionary performance bonus, or \$123,000. Nothing in our current privacy provisions or access to information allows any interested Canadian to find out anything about a performance bonus, and that to me is deficient.

• (1345)

This bill attempts to undo the damage done by the access committee on June 5 of this year, which incidentally was the same day I left the Conservative caucus, and to promote transparency and disclosure, not opaqueness and secrecy. Given all the allegations of secrecy and opaqueness in this town, I would think that the government would grab my amendments and support transparency and salvage its reputation.

**Mr. Dan Albas (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to share the government's position on Bill C-461.

Bill C-461 was introduced in the House on November 5, 2012 by the member for Edmonton—St. Albert. As we now know, this bill has generated a fair bit of discussion. I believe that is healthy in any democratic society.

Bill C-461 has been subject to amendments that have also generated healthy democratic discussion.

It is important to recognize that bills are sent to the committee stage review as part of our democratic process. Committee review allows for input from stakeholders, expert witnesses, and those who may be impacted by any proposed piece of legislation. Let us never forget that legislation can affect the lives of Canadians. It is why we, as parliamentarians, must listen to all sides and strive to achieve a balance.

Our government is supportive of the principles raised by the member for Edmonton—St. Albert. The amendments to Bill C-461 provide a better balance in recognizing the obligation of the federal government as an employer.

Our government supports this bill, as amended. What exactly has been amended? In my view, we should not overlook that Bill C-461 proposes amendments to the Privacy Act. These amendments also coincide with this government's continuing goal of increasing openness and transparency.

Currently, much of public servants' expenses or salaries are protected under the Privacy Act. The Privacy Act is an important piece of legislation that protects the personal information of all individuals, including federal employees. However, the Privacy Act also recognizes the fact that federal employees work in the public domain. Increasing accountability and transparency requires that more personal information be made available to the public when that information is about positions or their functions within a government institution. The Privacy Act provides that this type of personal information should not be protected when an access to information request is made. That type of information should be disclosed.

What Bill C-461 proposes to do is specify that all expenses incurred by federal officers or employees of a government institution in the course of their work and for which they are reimbursed are not protected as personal information under the Privacy Act. If there was any ambiguity before, it would now be clear that this information could and should be disclosed to a requester.

Under Bill C-461, if individuals, in the course of their employment, incurred an expense and were compensated for that expense by the government, that information, the amount of compensation, could be disclosed.

Governments must spend public money wisely and only where necessary. A person cannot expect that the reimbursement of a work-related expense by a government institution will be kept confidential. It is in the public interest that the law be crystal clear on this point. I believe that this is an important aspect of public accountability. This is a small but reasonable addition that will make things clear for everyone.

Another aspect of Bill C-461 relating to transparency and public expenditures is the disclosure of the salaries of certain officers of government institutions. Currently, the Privacy Act authorizes government institutions to disclose the salary range, the classification, and the responsibilities of the position held by all officers and employees. For all public servants, this information is not treated as personal information. Therefore, this information can be disclosed under an access request. We believe that for the majority of public servants, this is sufficient and reasonable.

Where I believe we need to go further is with respect to the highest paid individuals in government institutions. Many provinces disclose, often proactively, the exact salaries of its highest earners. These are called sunshine lists. Publicly traded corporations routinely release the amount of compensation for their top officers. The idea behind this is that stakeholders in the company deserve to know the exact amount the highest compensated individuals are taking home.

● (1350)

When it comes to government, all taxpayers are interested stakeholders, and they deserve to have this information. In these cases, it is not sufficient to know the salary ranges and job classifications of some of the highest earners in government. These people receive bonuses and other discretionary benefits from government institutions. Often what these individuals will receive at the end of the year from an institution is substantially higher than what is publicly announced for their position. That is why we believe that government institutions should be authorized to disclose the exact salary paid to the highest earners. This would include all the bonuses and benefits given to the individual.

We strongly believe, however, that this level of intrusion on an individual's privacy should be reserved for the highest paid individuals only. This is what we have done in Bill C-461.

In conclusion, I want to say that this bill enhances transparency in the operations of government while still maintaining a critical balance that is respectful of personal privacy.

Employees and institutions are entrusted with the financial administration of the public purse and should be able to demonstrate where and how that money is being spent. Individuals should be able to request records and review expenditures by public servants, and this should obviously include the CBC. It will improve the overall confidence and trust in our institutions.

I would urge this House to adopt Bill C-461 as it is presented today. The improvements this bill proposes to the Access to Information Act and the Privacy Act are sensible and promote transparency, openness, and accountability in key ways across government.

### *Private Members' Business*

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Pierre Nantel (Longueuil—Pierre-Boucher, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I really appreciated the idealistic tone of the speech by my colleague opposite. It is important for those watching us today to truly understand what has happened.

A Conservative member introduced a bill that will allow the public to find out exactly how much money all federal employees making more than \$188,600 are paid. He believes that this could lead to greater transparency in the public service and government agencies. We might think that he would have the support of his party, which was elected on the promise of transparency. Despite this reassuring tone, that is not at all the case.

On the contrary, his party let the member go ahead, the bill proceeded and, when the time came, the order was given to simply torpedo the bill, just like in a game of Battleship. When the bill was studied by the Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics, all the Conservative committee members calmly raised their hands, without a word of explanation, and gutted the bill. They changed the wording so that only 1% of the public service—those earning more than \$444,661 a year—would have to disclose their earnings. That is an absolute farce.

My colleague, the member for Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, who I imagine was quite baffled, suggested that we rename the bill to better reflect its content. He suggested that it be named “An Act respecting the transparency of public servants earning more than \$444,000 a year, with the exception of PMO employees”. I appreciate my colleague's rigour and concern for accuracy. We must call a spade a spade.

The last few months have been very difficult for the government. There have been major missteps and blunders, which generally indicate the end of a party's reign. The evolution of the bill is itself one of the Conservatives' major blunders.

Everything that elected Conservatives say they stand for, all the principles that they claimed as their own when campaigning and wanted to defend by putting their name on the ballot and asking for their neighbour's support, the very reasons they came to Ottawa for the first time as parliamentarians and proudly took their seats, all these principles are today back on the table. They are being called into question; they have been violated. It is shameful.

I am not questioning the good faith of most of my colleagues opposite. On the contrary, I put myself in their shoes, and I wonder how they might explain what happened here to their constituents or their base. On what basis can they justify and accept the government's actions in this case? There is some cause to wonder. There are some grounds for serious doubts, right?

*Private Members' Business*

No, that does not seem to be the case, since the Conservative members knew that one of their own wanted to introduce a bill on the disclosure of salaries of public servants and federal agencies. This is something that many of them would have probably supported, but they knew that there was an order from above, probably from the famous little boys in short pants running around in the Prime Minister's Office. We now know that they kept a close watch on everything that was going on in Ottawa to neutralize the provisions of the bill that amended the Privacy Act in order to allow for the disclosure of salaries.

This was to be a quick and dirty job, done discreetly and swiftly. Furthermore, the member who had the thankless task of proposing amendments to gut the bill, the member for Mississauga—Streetsville, whom I have to name here, did not even bother to explain himself or defend his position. He had to know that he was doing something that did not smell quite right. He clearly did not try to draw attention to his actions.

Moreover, all the Conservative members here fell in line and voted for the amendment. That said, all this was done in silence. No member bothered to speak. There are some things you just cannot talk about.

The government loudly and constantly claims to speak on behalf of taxpayers. However, the Canadian Taxpayers Federation expressed its disgust—yes, its disgust—at the government's actions on this front.

The federation's representative, Gregory Thomas, had this to say after a close look at Bill C-461: “Not one witness, nor one committee member even spoke to why increasing the threshold was a good idea. Probably because they couldn't think of even one good reason.”

According to him, “Canadians expect openness from the Harper government, not cover-ups and stonewalling.”

He went on to say, “This is another example where the government is not walking its own talk when it comes to accountability.”

In closing, he stated that, “In light of recent scandals, we need more information and accountability from this government, not less.”

He was right when he said that not one witness supported the idea of increasing the threshold for disclosure. On the contrary, those very witnesses, including the Office of the Information—

• (1355)

[*English*]

**Mr. Jeff Watson:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. As a reminder, proper names should not be used in the chamber, but instead should be referred to by either their position title or their riding.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton):** I thank the parliamentary secretary for his intervention on that. Members know that is a practice that is prohibited in the House by the Standing Orders. I thank him for catching it. I happened to be engaged in a different discussion here momentarily and I will put my attention to the hon. member for Longueuil—Pierre-Boucher.

**Mr. Pierre Nantel:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, but we are all mistaken because I am quoting Gregory Thomas from the Canadian Taxpayers Federation.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton):** In fact, the standing order concerning the use of other names applies even if the name is found in a quotation. The same rule applies in this case.

**An. hon. member:** I do not understand.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton):** If the name is used in a quotation, the same rule applies. The member should replace it with the member's title or riding.

The hon. member for Longueuil—Pierre-Boucher.

**Mr. Pierre Nantel:** This is complete chaos; I did not name anyone. I quoted a person, whom I named. In any case, let us not waste time on this. Let us not make mountains out of molehills. We should be discussing more important things.

That individual was quite right in saying that no witnesses supported the proposal to increase the disclosure level.

On the contrary, those same witnesses, including the Information Commissioner, the Privacy Commissioner and the president of the Fédération professionnelle des journalistes du Québec, all had plenty to say about the bill and the amendments put forward by the Conservatives. However, none of what was said by the experts was retained by the Conservative majority in the committee.

For example, the Information Commissioner proposed replacing the term “independence” with “activity” after many witnesses insisted that the bill was a threat to journalism and investigative journalism in particular. Obviously, the Conservatives rejected that recommendation.

Then the commissioner issued a very clear plea to the committee, asking it not to add a new exclusion to the assortment of exceptions and exclusions already set out in the bill, because that exclusion would require clarification from the courts. The Conservatives added it anyway.

In this case as well, the Conservatives flatly refused the Information Commissioner and added a new exclusion to the bill for journalistic sources, an exclusion that we know will be completely ineffective, useless and very costly and will not really do anything to protect journalistic sources. On the contrary, it exposes sources and undermines many sources' confidence in CBC journalists.

The stated purpose of the bill was to clarify section 68.1 of the Access to Information Act, which has been the subject of litigation. The bill's sponsor reminded us that that section was not a model of clarity. It is important to remember that that section has already been clarified, not by Parliament, but by the courts. This matter was resolved two years ago, to the satisfaction of all parties involved.

The bill, as it is being presented today, completely reopens this closed file and makes a mockery of the Federal Court and Federal Court of Appeal decisions. This would be like taking a circular saw to a wound that is just starting to heal. What this means is that a bill that is supposed to be in the taxpayers' interest will in fact cost hundreds of thousands of dollars in new court cases. New definitions will be needed.

The Information Commissioner very clearly said not to add a new exclusion in the bill. She said:

...please consider this: you are going to create another difficult situation if we create another exclusion to an exemption. How that's going to work, I really don't know.

These comments did not come from just anyone. She knows that such a bill will lead to even more litigation and court challenges.

Today, this bill's sponsor recommended that we remove these clauses from the bill, and I commend him for stepping up. We now know that these provisions will cost taxpayers dearly. We know that this bill is very far from being a model of clarity and that it would replace a solution with a problem.

It is not easy for the Conservatives to justify this bill to ensure transparency, when the bill itself is not transparent at all and it will cost taxpayers a fortune.

Although the bill's short title is "CBC and Public Service Disclosure and Transparency Act", its salary disclosure provisions do not even apply to the president of the CBC, whose salary falls below the disclosure threshold, which the Conservatives just raised by \$250,000.

Behind the doors of a committee room in Ottawa, the Conservatives quietly increased the minimum salary disclosure threshold to \$444,661. This is 11 times the salary of an average worker in Canada.

I wonder how the Conservatives will justify such a move. How will they explain such a decision to their constituents? What will they tell their party faithful, who have been fighting for years to have the government monitor the public purse and spend carefully, and to make it more transparent and accountable?

Those in this room who support greater transparency, accountability and respect for the public purse, and those who care about doing a good job on this bill as legislators, now know what they have to do.

• (1400)

[English]

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise today to speak to Bill C-461.

First I would like to compliment the member for Edmonton—St. Albert. He has obviously made an exceptional effort to get a better appreciation and understanding of getting a bill passed through the House, which can be a challenge at the best of times, as we all know. He has identified an issue that we collectively in the House hear a lot about. In the last number of months we have heard a lot about transparency and accountability, whether in this House or the Senate chambers.

### *Private Members' Business*

In his own way the member has identified another way that we can ensure more transparency and accountability. I very much respect that.

It is most interesting to see the original wording of the bill and where it is today, where I had the privilege to second some amendments.

I am hopeful that members will see this situation for what it is. This private member has taken an exceptional amount of time to get a good understanding of an issue and then put it forward to the House of Commons. I have been a parliamentarian for over 20 years, and one of the things that I really respect about the House is the fact that we have private members' bills. We have hundreds of them.

Sadly, less than half will actually be dealt with. I think I am right in saying they number 200 or something of this nature, and if we sit enough days, my bill might actually come before the House, but most bills will never be voted upon.

It is a privilege to be in the House. It is a great opportunity if one gets the opportunity to bring an idea before the House. I like to think that at the very least we should preserve that aspect about private members' hour. It should not be based on party policy forcing all government members to vote a certain way or all Liberal members to vote a certain way. The same applies to the New Democratic Party. This should not happen during private members' hour when we are dealing with an issue of this nature. My understanding is it is supposed to be a free vote.

In looking at the legislation and the amendments that have been brought forward, and based on what I witnessed in the second reading vote and on my understanding of the issue of transparency and accountability, I believe the bill as amended should be able to pass on merit alone.

In the procedure and House affairs committee we were talking about proactive disclosure and how we in the Liberal Party have proactive disclosure. People can click on to the net and see the cost when I have flown to Winnipeg and come back. My hospitality costs are there. It is all there to be seen. The Conservatives are not exactly sure what it is yet, but they are saying "us too". The NDP is saying it will at some point.

Why do I say that? It is because the member for Edmonton—St. Albert has found something all of us should be supporting. There were some reservations when it came in for second reading, if memory serves me correctly. I would have voted against it going into committee. The reason for that was the CBC aspect, but the CBC is no longer a factor in it now.

• (1405)

One of the nice things about committee is that members are afforded the opportunity to make some changes. We should value that aspect. It is the same thing with report stage. That is an important aspect of private members' bills.

One thing we have to be very careful of—

**Mr. Costas Menegakis:** What's that?

*Private Members' Business*

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux:** The member asks what that is. That is a private member's bill being hijacked. That happens. One of his colleagues in the immigration committee, for example, had a bill that went to committee. The former critic for immigration will recall it quite well. The bill was turned into something it was not intended to be. The person who sponsored the bill at the beginning had no intention of doing what the government was trying to do through amendments. It ultimately came back to the House, because it was so far out of scope, and a Speaker's ruling had to be made.

We should be valuing the importance of private members' bills. How can a private member's initiative be changed to the degree where one is going against what the private member originally wanted? If I, as a private member, bring in legislation and explain the direction I want to take it, and once it gets to committee the government makes changes to that legislation, it has, in essence, hijacked my bill.

I think my bill is ranked at number 200. Hopefully mine will be voted on and it will go to committee. It is not easy to get that far.

The member for Edmonton—St. Albert has been very successful in getting it to the committee stage.

**Mr. John Williamson:** No thanks to you. You voted against it.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux:** The point is that it was sent there. I believe that any changes made to a private member's bill should have the consent of the private member who sponsored the bill. If the private member does not agree with the changes, what makes others believe that they have the right to take it away from the private member? That is something that really confuses me. We should be very careful.

Mr. Speaker, on occasion, in private members' business hour, the Liberal caucus does not always vote collectively as one unit on a private member's bill. It is because Liberals support individuals looking at private members' bills for what they are: private members' bills. I have seen first hand that Conservatives have stood in their places and voted both ways on a particular bill. That is not something to be embarrassed by. They should be applauded for it, because they are private members' bills.

My recommendation to all members of the chamber is to look at what the amendments are saying. If it gets beyond \$444,000, it has to be disclosed. What percentage of the population makes a half million dollars? It is incredible. It is almost at the point where we should not even bother.

**Mr. Jeff Watson:** There are a lot of them in the federal government, and you know it.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux:** Sure, there are a number of them, but what is being proposed in the amendments is far more reasonable. It deals with the issue.

My challenge to members is to give the bill back to the member who actually sponsored it and listen to what the amendments are actually saying. Let us keep the tradition of the House in terms of voting for private members' bills on their own merits. That is my appeal to all members of all political parties.

● (1410)

**Mr. John Williamson (New Brunswick Southwest, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the bill and its amendments. I have to say that from my vantage point, it is interesting to see some of the strange bedfellows who have jumped in to support the member for Edmonton—St. Albert.

The member for Winnipeg North talked about how he is confused by this. I find that statement to be accurate, largely because it seems that he is unaware of the content of the amendments that are being proposed here today and how they deal directly with the CBC and the reforms that are important and necessary.

It is worth highlighting, as well, that the opposition member, along with many in the opposition, voted to defeat the bill when it was sent to committee stage at second reading. I and others look forward to seeing how they will vote on the bill, and if that amendment is successful, how they will vote after that, if in fact they are sincere about the need to protect and report on how tax dollars are spent. I have my doubts, but we will see.

I am speaking today because when I spoke on the bill initially I called for some of the very amendments that are being put forward today. While I was supportive of the bill, I felt that the level for reporting of federal employees should not be the \$180,000 that the member for Edmonton—St. Albert was proposing but in fact should be the same salary as a member of Parliament, which is approximately \$160,000.

I still feel that way. I think that represents the top 2% of income earners in this country and it is a good level for Canadians to consider when they look at how their dollars are being spent and who is being paid what.

I will point out that in fact the bill is not out of line with legislation we see elsewhere in the country, albeit at the provincial level. For example, Nova Scotia and Ontario require the disclosure of the name, salary and job title for anyone making \$100,000 or more from their respective provincial governments. These sunshine lists, as they are called, and rightly so because they do provide some insight for taxpayers, hold those governments accountable for the salaries given to the top bureaucrats, civil servants and anyone else who earns six figures or more per year from the government.

I should note as an aside that Manitoba, where the member for Winnipeg North is from, sets its transparency level at \$50,000. My own province of New Brunswick has a disclosure limit set at \$60,000. In addition, any employee of the Government of New Brunswick receiving in excess of \$10,000 in retirement is also subject to public disclosure.

These acts across the country at the provincial level have worked and they have worked well to give taxpayers across the country a better idea of how governments are spending their money. I will note these numbers are reported annually and they have been a good thing for taxpayers and open government.



*Private Members' Business*

That philosophy represents my view on the bill. I will say, regardless of the outcome of the vote on the amendments of the member for Edmonton—St. Albert, I will be supporting the bill. We heard earlier from the parliamentary secretary. Broadly speaking I agree with what he was saying in terms of the need for transparency and accountability. I just happen to not agree with that member on where that threshold should be. Again, my view is that it should be \$160,000. I said that when we had the first debate on the bill, and I continue to maintain that. I will be voting for the amendments as put forward by the member for Edmonton—St. Albert.

I am also going to do it for another reason. The other place, as we refer to the Senate, not so recently changed a private member's bill from the House of Commons, Bill C-377. One of the arguments they used for increasing the threshold level in that bill, which was a good piece of legislation and one I supported, was that they set the disclosure for union transparency at the same level, about \$444,000, I believe.

I would like to send a message back to the Senate on that bill that we ought to work in a way that expands transparency, both for the public sector as well as for the unions.

●(1415)

That encompasses my thinking on the bill. Again, I find it interesting how the opposition has suddenly rallied behind the bill. I only wish that had more to do with the well-being of taxpayers across the country and not political opportunism.

I regret that my former colleague, the member for Edmonton—St. Albert, no longer sits on this side of the House. Having said that, his bill would improve transparency within the Government of Canada. That is why I will vote in favour of it. I urge my colleagues on this side of the House as well as my colleagues on that side of the House to do the same.

**Mr. Murray Rankin (Victoria, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, at the outset, I want to be as clear as I can about my position on the bill, and it is rather convoluted how we got here. In its present form, with the amendments offered in the motion by my friend from Edmonton—St. Albert, I would be 100% behind what he has done and I commend him for his amendments to the bill. However, if those amendments were not enacted by the House, I would be utterly opposed to this legislation for reasons I would like to outline.

I understand these amendments were required after the Conservative caucus gutted the original bill brought in by the member when he was still on the government bench. These changes to the bill before the amendments on the motion paper were rammed through by the Conservatives on the committee. It would allow scrutiny for only those people earning more than \$444,000.

As the member for Winnipeg North put it eloquently, that is a very small number of people, almost half a million dollars a year, and only those people with incomes higher than that income level would be subject to the scrutiny of this legislation, which is shameful and is entirely inconsistent with the views of the Privacy Commissioner of Canada when she testified before the committee. If anyone should be worried about privacy, it would be she and, in fact, she is entirely on board, as I will explain in a moment.

The purpose of the amendments is to provide true accountability to the taxpayers and all Canadians to know just how much money people are earning in the public sector. It seems to me the threshold was set at a very fair level. I commend my friend for New Brunswick Southwest for acknowledging this. It is a very fair threshold. That is what only 2% of the population make, namely \$160,000 some or more. I commend him for referencing that situation. I agree that would provide more accountability than the anemic legislation that would only allow specific knowledge of salaries and bonuses when they exceeded some \$444,000. I think Canadians would see right through the sham of that bill being portrayed as some kind of access to information or accountability measure, on the contrary.

The legislation has been changed in the committee, as I said, to try to make it up to \$444,000. I see that as exactly the opposite of transparency.

There was something said in the committee by the hon. member for Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie that struck me as rather shocking. He pointed out that the author of the bill, the hon. member for Edmonton—St. Albert, said in his testimony that Canada had fallen to 56th out of 90 countries with regard to transparency. I am quite ashamed of my country's record on access to information. We used to be seen as a bit of a beacon. Now we are seen as a laggard when it comes to information and access. I will speak about this in some greater detail in a moment, as I put this, I hope, into some broader context.

What did the Privacy Commissioner say about the fact that individual salaries would be made known? Is that some kind of privacy breach? We would think that as the watchdog in that field, she would be the first to be concerned, but she in fact was not. We have a very superb Privacy Commissioner who has served the country with distinction over the last few years, and I was really impressed with her testimony.

My friend from New Brunswick Southwest has already given some rather interesting statistics on this. I would like to repeat some of them and emphasize a couple of others.

Some governments use thresholds to disclose the salaries of public sector employees. Some governments, for example in Manitoba, as he pointed out, have a very low threshold, \$50,000. People making therefore more than \$50,000 it is perfectly okay to know what their salaries, including bonuses, would be. British Columbia has \$125,000 threshold. Other places, Ontario and Nova Scotia have \$100,000 and so on. After that magic number is reached in a given province, one is able to know just how much those individuals are paid.

The Privacy Commissioner said something really telling. She said that in the private sector, publicly traded companies had to disclose the compensation paid to their chief executive officer, chief financial officer and the next top three executives, all their shares, all their options and all their bonuses for anyone earning more than \$150,000 in total compensation, which is remarkably close to the threshold that has been proposed in the motion by the hon. member for Edmonton—St. Albert.

*Private Members' Business*

● (1420)

Given these examples, I want to quote the Privacy Commissioner. She said:

...it would appear that disclosure of salaries for individuals in leadership roles within organizations, in both the [Canadian] public sector and private enterprise, is already best practice.

She also said:

In the opinion of my office, and taking into account best practices elsewhere in Canada, the disclosure of the salaries of the most senior officials in the federal public sector does not represent a significant privacy risk relative to the goal of transparency and the broader public interest.

Therefore, we are good to go, to use an expression that is used a lot in the Prime Minister's Office. We are good to go with this legislation, according to the Privacy Commissioner of Canada. I respect very much that she has given us the green light to do this.

With regard to bonuses, it was very clear, at the committee stage, that the hon. member for Edmonton—St. Albert intended bonuses to be considered part of the compensation package. He pointed out that sometimes, and I was shocked to learn this, bonuses can be as high as 39% of one's remuneration. Consequently, it is a very wise thing to have included. I commend him that in the motion he prepared and put on the order paper, he is explicitly including those bonuses, and I thank him for his efforts.

I want to put this in a broader context. This is a bill purporting to amend the Access to Information Act. I studied this at graduate school and lobbied for the Canadian Bar Association when the first Access to Information Act was being considered in the House. Later I worked for the committee that studied the Access to Information and Privacy Acts as a research officer when the six-year review was undertaken.

The first government to have to live with the Access to Information Act was the Conservative government of the right hon. Mr. Mulroney. The government has had to live with this legislation. Others have talked about it.

I have to say, when I heard today and yesterday that emails were being deleted in the Prime Minister's Office, or are at least alleged to have been by the RCMP, I was quite shocked. I was actually, frankly, saddened to hear that this is what we have come to in our country.

We have heard about the pathetic ranking of our country as a laggard on access to information. However, to think that the RCMP believes that people are destroying emails, which requires, under the Library and Archives Act of Canada, explicit permission before that is done, is absolutely pathetic, if that is true.

The Conservatives talk about an accountability act, and I was proud when they brought that in, but to see the implementation of that act and the way the government is acting now vis-à-vis freedom of information is, frankly, absolutely shocking.

I want to again say that the context is relevant for this amendment. Our Information Commissioner, on October 17, in her annual report, used words I have never seen in a report by an independent officer of Parliament. She said this about the government's commitment to freedom of information. She said that the report highlighted weaknesses in the information system that need to be urgently addressed. There are institutions that do not have enough staff to even acknowledge that they have received requests for six months. She said,

All together, these circumstances tell me in no uncertain terms that the integrity of the federal access to information program is at serious risk.

This is not partisan rhetoric. This is the Information Commissioner of Canada reporting to Parliament on what she has discovered about the government's commitment to openness.

In conclusion, I respect enormously the amendments proposed by my hon. friend from Edmonton—St. Albert, and I hope that they are accepted by the House.

● (1425)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton):** Resuming debate. Although we have one minute left, I am going to call on the hon. member for Newton—North Delta. I am sure she can probably improvise for a minute or so as to part of her remarks, and that will take us through the hour provided for private members' business. The hon. member.

**Ms. Jinny Jogindera Sims (Newton—North Delta, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, it is really telling today that what we are talking about is accountability and transparency.

The member for Edmonton—St. Albert put forward a private member's bill that would have given more transparency. Yet the very government that purports to speak for and stand for accountability and transparency is the one that gutted the bill and raised the threshold for the disclosure of earnings and bonuses, et cetera.

This is not the first time. With the fiasco happening in the Senate, we have seen over and over again, day in and day out, that the government does not understand the terms "transparency", "accountability", or "telling the truth".

● (1430)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton):** The hon. member for Newton—North Delta will have nine minutes remaining for her remarks when the House next returns to debate on this motion at report stage.

The time provided for the consideration of private members' business has now expired. The order is dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence on the order paper.

It being 2:30 p.m., the House stands adjourned until Monday at 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 2:30 p.m.)





## **APPENDIX**

**ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS WITH THEIR  
CONSTITUENCIES, PROVINCE OF CONSTITUENCY  
AND POLITICAL AFFILIATIONS;  
COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE,  
THE MINISTRY AND PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY**

**CHAIR OCCUPANTS**

**The Speaker**

HON. ANDREW SCHEER

**The Deputy Speaker and Chair of Committees of the Whole**

MR. JOE COMARTIN

**The Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole**

MR. BARRY DEVOLIN

**The Assistant Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole**

MR. BRUCE STANTON

---

**BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY**

HON. ANDREW SCHEER CHAIR OF THE BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

MR. NATHAN CULLEN MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

HON. JOHN DUNCAN MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

MS. JUDY FOOTE MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

HON. ROB MERRIFIELD MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

MS. NYCOLE TURMEL MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

HON. PETER VAN LOAN MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

## ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

## Second Session—Forty-first Parliament

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Ablonczy, Hon. Diane	Calgary—Nose Hill	Alberta	CPC
Adams, Eve, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health	Mississauga—Brampton South	Ontario	CPC
Adler, Mark	York Centre	Ontario	CPC
Aglukkaq, Hon. Leona, Minister of the Environment, Minister of the Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency and Minister for the Arctic Council	Nunavut	Nunavut	CPC
Albas, Dan, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board	Okanagan—Coquihalla	British Columbia	CPC
Albrecht, Harold	Kitchener—Conestoga	Ontario	CPC
Alexander, Hon. Chris, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Ajax—Pickering	Ontario	CPC
Allen, Malcolm	Welland	Ontario	NDP
Allen, Mike	Tobique—Mactaquac	New Brunswick	CPC
Allison, Dean	Niagara West—Glanbrook	Ontario	CPC
Ambler, Stella	Mississauga South	Ontario	CPC
Ambrose, Hon. Rona, Minister of Health	Edmonton—Spruce Grove	Alberta	CPC
Anders, Rob	Calgary West	Alberta	CPC
Anderson, David, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs	Cypress Hills—Grasslands	Saskatchewan	CPC
Andrews, Scott	Avalon	Newfoundland and Labrador	Lib.
Angus, Charlie	Timmins—James Bay	Ontario	NDP
Armstrong, Scott, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Employment and Social Development	Cumberland—Colchester— Musquodoboit Valley	Nova Scotia	CPC
Ashfield, Hon. Keith	Fredericton	New Brunswick	CPC
Ashton, Niki	Churchill	Manitoba	NDP
Aspin, Jay	Nipissing—Timiskaming	Ontario	CPC
Atamanenko, Alex	British Columbia Southern Interior	British Columbia	NDP
Aubin, Robert	Trois-Rivières	Québec	NDP
Ayala, Paulina	Honoré-Mercier	Québec	NDP
Baird, Hon. John, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Ottawa West—Nepean	Ontario	CPC
Bateman, Joyce	Winnipeg South Centre	Manitoba	CPC
Bélanger, Hon. Mauril	Ottawa—Vanier	Ontario	Lib.
Bellavance, André	Richmond—Arthabaska	Québec	BQ
Bennett, Hon. Carolyn	St. Paul's	Ontario	Lib.
Benoit, Leon	Vegreville—Wainwright	Alberta	CPC
Benskin, Tyrone	Jeanne-Le Ber	Québec	NDP
Bergen, Hon. Candice, Minister of State (Social Development)	Portage—Lisgar	Manitoba	CPC
Bernier, Hon. Maxime, Minister of State (Small Business and Tourism, and Agriculture)	Beauce	Québec	CPC
Bevington, Dennis	Western Arctic	Northwest Territories	NDP
Bezan, James, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence	Selkirk—Interlake	Manitoba	CPC
Blanchette, Denis	Louis-Hébert	Québec	NDP
Blanchette-Lamothe, Lysane	Pierrefonds—Dollard	Québec	NDP
Blaney, Hon. Steven, Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness	Lévis—Bellechasse	Québec	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Block, Kelly, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources	Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar	Saskatchewan	CPC
Boivin, Françoise	Gatineau	Québec	NDP
Borg, Charmaine	Terrebonne—Blainville	Québec	NDP
Boughen, Ray	Palliser	Saskatchewan	CPC
Boulerice, Alexandre	Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie	Québec	NDP
Boutin-Sweet, Marjolaine	Hochelaga	Québec	NDP
Brahmi, Tarik	Saint-Jean	Québec	NDP
Braid, Peter, Parliamentary Secretary for Infrastructure and Communities	Kitchener—Waterloo	Ontario	CPC
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton—Melville	Saskatchewan	CPC
Brison, Hon. Scott	Kings—Hants	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Brosseau, Ruth Ellen	Berthier—Maskinongé	Québec	NDP
Brown, Gordon	Leeds—Grenville	Ontario	CPC
Brown, Lois, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Development	Newmarket—Aurora	Ontario	CPC
Brown, Patrick	Barrie	Ontario	CPC
Bruinooge, Rod	Winnipeg South	Manitoba	CPC
Butt, Brad	Mississauga—Streetsville	Ontario	CPC
Byrne, Hon. Gerry	Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte	Newfoundland and Labrador	Lib.
Calandra, Paul, Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs	Oak Ridges—Markham	Ontario	CPC
Calkins, Blaine	Wetaskiwin	Alberta	CPC
Cannan, Hon. Ron	Kelowna—Lake Country	British Columbia	CPC
Carmichael, John	Don Valley West	Ontario	CPC
Caron, Guy	Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques	Québec	NDP
Carrie, Colin, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment	Oshawa	Ontario	CPC
Casey, Sean	Charlottetown	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
Cash, Andrew	Davenport	Ontario	NDP
Charlton, Chris	Hamilton Mountain	Ontario	NDP
Chicoine, Sylvain	Châteauguay—Saint-Constant	Québec	NDP
Chisholm, Robert	Dartmouth—Cole Harbour	Nova Scotia	NDP
Chisu, Corneliu	Pickering—Scarborough East	Ontario	CPC
Chong, Hon. Michael	Wellington—Halton Hills	Ontario	CPC
Choquette, François	Drummond	Québec	NDP
Chow, Olivia	Trinity—Spadina	Ontario	NDP
Christopherson, David	Hamilton Centre	Ontario	NDP
Clarke, Rob	Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill River	Saskatchewan	CPC
Cleary, Ryan	St. John's South—Mount Pearl	Newfoundland and Labrador	NDP
Clement, Hon. Tony, President of the Treasury Board	Parry Sound—Muskoka	Ontario	CPC
Comartin, Joe, The Deputy Speaker	Windsor—Tecumseh	Ontario	NDP
Côté, Raymond	Beauport—Limoilou	Québec	NDP
Cotler, Hon. Irwin	Mount Royal	Québec	Lib.
Crockatt, Joan	Calgary Centre	Alberta	CPC
Crowder, Jean	Nanaimo—Cowichan	British Columbia	NDP
Cullen, Nathan	Skeena—Bulkley Valley	British Columbia	NDP



Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Cuzner, Rodger	Cape Breton—Canso	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Daniel, Joe	Don Valley East	Ontario	CPC
Davidson, Patricia	Sarnia—Lambton	Ontario	CPC
Davies, Don	Vancouver Kingsway	British Columbia	NDP
Davies, Libby	Vancouver East	British Columbia	NDP
Day, Anne-Marie	Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles	Québec	NDP
Dechert, Bob, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice	Mississauga—Erindale	Ontario	CPC
Del Mastro, Dean	Peterborough	Ontario	Cons. Ind.
Devolin, Barry, The Acting Speaker	Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brock	Ontario	CPC
Dewar, Paul	Ottawa Centre	Ontario	NDP
Dion, Hon. Stéphane, Saint-Laurent—Cartierville	Saint-Laurent—Cartierville	Québec	Lib.
Dionne Labelle, Pierre	Rivière-du-Nord	Québec	NDP
Donnelly, Fin	New Westminster—Coquitlam	British Columbia	NDP
Doré Lefebvre, Rosane	Alfred-Pellan	Québec	NDP
Dreeshen, Earl	Red Deer	Alberta	CPC
Dubé, Matthew	Chambly—Borduas	Québec	NDP
Duncan, Hon. John, Minister of State and Chief Government Whip	Vancouver Island North	British Columbia	CPC
Duncan, Kirsty	Etobicoke North	Ontario	Lib.
Duncan, Linda	Edmonton—Strathcona	Alberta	NDP
Dusseault, Pierre-Luc	Sherbrooke	Québec	NDP
Dykstra, Rick, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage	St. Catharines	Ontario	CPC
Easter, Hon. Wayne	Malpeque	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
Eyking, Hon. Mark	Sydney—Victoria	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Fantino, Hon. Julian, Minister of Veterans Affairs	Vaughan	Ontario	CPC
Fast, Hon. Ed, Minister of International Trade	Abbotsford	British Columbia	CPC
Findlay, Hon. Kerry-Lynne D., Minister of National Revenue	Delta—Richmond East	British Columbia	CPC
Finley, Hon. Diane, Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Haldimand—Norfolk	Ontario	CPC
Flaherty, Hon. Jim, Minister of Finance	Whitby—Oshawa	Ontario	CPC
Fletcher, Hon. Steven	Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia	Manitoba	CPC
Foote, Judy	Random—Burin—St. George's	Newfoundland and Labrador	Lib.
Fortin, Jean-François	Haute-Gaspésie—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia	Québec	BQ
Freeman, Mylène	Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel	Québec	NDP
Fry, Hon. Hedy	Vancouver Centre	British Columbia	Lib.
Galipeau, Royal	Ottawa—Orléans	Ontario	CPC
Gallant, Cheryl	Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke	Ontario	CPC
Garneau, Marc	Westmount—Ville-Marie	Québec	Lib.
Garrison, Randall	Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca	British Columbia	NDP
Genest, Réjean	Shefford	Québec	NDP
Genest-Jourdain, Jonathan	Manicouagan	Québec	NDP
Giguère, Alain	Marc-Aurèle-Fortin	Québec	NDP
Gill, Parm, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs	Brampton—Springdale	Ontario	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Glover, Hon. Shelly, Minister of Canadian Heritage and Official Languages.....	Saint Boniface.....	Manitoba.....	CPC
Godin, Yvon.....	Acadie—Bathurst.....	New Brunswick.....	NDP
Goguen, Robert, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice	Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe	New Brunswick.....	CPC
Goldring, Peter.....	Edmonton East.....	Alberta.....	CPC
Goodale, Hon. Ralph.....	Wascana.....	Saskatchewan.....	Lib.
Goodyear, Hon. Gary, Minister of State (Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario).....	Cambridge.....	Ontario.....	CPC
Gosal, Hon. Bal, Minister of State (Sport).....	Bramalea—Gore—Malton.....	Ontario.....	CPC
Gourde, Jacques, Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, for Official Languages and for the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec.....	Lotbinière—Chutes-de-la-Chaudière.....	Québec.....	CPC
Gravelle, Claude.....	Nickel Belt.....	Ontario.....	NDP
Grewal, Nina.....	Fleetwood—Port Kells.....	British Columbia.....	CPC
Groguhé, Sadia.....	Saint-Lambert.....	Québec.....	NDP
Harper, Right Hon. Stephen, Prime Minister.....	Calgary Southwest.....	Alberta.....	CPC
Harris, Dan.....	Scarborough Southwest.....	Ontario.....	NDP
Harris, Jack.....	St. John's East.....	Newfoundland and Labrador.....	NDP
Harris, Richard.....	Cariboo—Prince George.....	British Columbia.....	CPC
Hassainia, Sana.....	Verchères—Les Patriotes.....	Québec.....	NDP
Hawn, Hon. Laurie.....	Edmonton Centre.....	Alberta.....	CPC
Hayes, Bryan.....	Sault Ste. Marie.....	Ontario.....	CPC
Hiebert, Russ.....	South Surrey—White Rock—Cloverdale.....	British Columbia.....	CPC
Hillyer, Jim.....	Lethbridge.....	Alberta.....	CPC
Hoback, Randy.....	Prince Albert.....	Saskatchewan.....	CPC
Holder, Ed.....	London West.....	Ontario.....	CPC
Hsu, Ted.....	Kingston and the Islands.....	Ontario.....	Lib.
Hughes, Carol.....	Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapusksing.....	Ontario.....	NDP
Hyer, Bruce.....	Thunder Bay—Superior North.....	Ontario.....	Ind.
Jacob, Pierre.....	Brome—Missisquoi.....	Québec.....	NDP
James, Roxanne, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness.....	Scarborough Centre.....	Ontario.....	CPC
Jean, Brian.....	Fort McMurray—Athabasca.....	Alberta.....	CPC
Jones, Yvonne.....	Labrador.....	Newfoundland and Labrador.....	Lib.
Julian, Peter.....	Burnaby—New Westminster.....	British Columbia.....	NDP
Kamp, Randy, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans.....	Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission.....	British Columbia.....	CPC
Karygiannis, Hon. Jim.....	Scarborough—Agincourt.....	Ontario.....	Lib.
Keddy, Gerald, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Revenue and for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency.....	South Shore—St. Margaret's.....	Nova Scotia.....	CPC
Kellway, Matthew.....	Beaches—East York.....	Ontario.....	NDP
Kenney, Hon. Jason, Minister of Employment and Social Development and Minister for Multiculturalism.....	Calgary Southeast.....	Alberta.....	CPC
Kent, Hon. Peter.....	Thornhill.....	Ontario.....	CPC
Kerr, Greg.....	West Nova.....	Nova Scotia.....	CPC
Komarnicki, Ed.....	Souris—Moose Mountain.....	Saskatchewan.....	CPC
Kramp, Daryl.....	Prince Edward—Hastings.....	Ontario.....	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Lake, Hon. Mike, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry	Edmonton—Mill Woods— Beaumont.....	Alberta .....	CPC
Lamoureux, Kevin .....	Winnipeg North .....	Manitoba .....	Lib.
Lapointe, François .....	Montmagny—L'Islet— Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup	Québec .....	NDP
Larose, Jean-François .....	Repentigny .....	Québec .....	NDP
Latendresse, Alexandrine .....	Louis-Saint-Laurent.....	Québec .....	NDP
Lauzon, Guy.....	Stormont—Dundas—South Glengary .....	Ontario .....	CPC
Laverdière, Hélène .....	Laurier—Sainte-Marie .....	Québec .....	NDP
Lebel, Hon. Denis, Minister of Infrastructure, Communities and Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister of the Economic Devel- opment Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec .....	Roberval—Lac-Saint-Jean.....	Québec .....	CPC
LeBlanc, Hon. Dominic .....	Beauséjour.....	New Brunswick.....	Lib.
LeBlanc, Hélène.....	LaSalle—Émard.....	Québec .....	NDP
Leef, Ryan .....	Yukon.....	Yukon .....	CPC
Leitch, Hon. Kellie, Minister of Labour and Minister of Status of Women .....	Simcoe—Grey .....	Ontario .....	CPC
Lemieux, Pierre, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture.....	Glengarry—Prescott—Russell .	Ontario .....	CPC
Leslie, Megan .....	Halifax .....	Nova Scotia .....	NDP
Leung, Chungsen, Parliamentary Secretary for Multiculturalism ...	Willowdale .....	Ontario .....	CPC
Liu, Laurin.....	Rivière-des-Mille-Îles.....	Québec .....	NDP
Lizon, Wladyslaw .....	Mississauga East—Cooksville .	Ontario .....	CPC
Lobb, Ben .....	Huron—Bruce.....	Ontario .....	CPC
Lukiwski, Tom, Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons .....	Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre.....	Saskatchewan .....	CPC
Lunney, James.....	Nanaimo—Alberni .....	British Columbia .....	CPC
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence .....	Cardigan .....	Prince Edward Island....	Lib.
MacKay, Hon. Peter, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada .....	Central Nova .....	Nova Scotia .....	CPC
MacKenzie, Dave .....	Oxford .....	Ontario .....	CPC
Mai, Hoang .....	Brossard—La Prairie .....	Québec .....	NDP
Marston, Wayne .....	Hamilton East—Stoney Creek .	Ontario .....	NDP
Martin, Pat.....	Winnipeg Centre .....	Manitoba .....	NDP
Masse, Brian.....	Windsor West .....	Ontario .....	NDP
Mathyssen, Irene .....	London—Fanshawe.....	Ontario .....	NDP
May, Elizabeth .....	Saanich—Gulf Islands .....	British Columbia .....	GP
Mayes, Colin .....	Okanagan—Shuswap .....	British Columbia .....	CPC
McCallum, Hon. John .....	Markham—Unionville .....	Ontario .....	Lib.
McColeman, Phil.....	Brant.....	Ontario .....	CPC
McGuinty, David.....	Ottawa South.....	Ontario .....	Lib.
McKay, Hon. John .....	Scarborough—Guildwood.....	Ontario .....	Lib.
McLeod, Cathy, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour and for Western Economic Diversification .....	Kamloops—Thompson— Cariboo .....	British Columbia .....	CPC
Menegakis, Costas, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration .....	Richmond Hill .....	Ontario .....	CPC
Merrifield, Hon. Rob .....	Yellowhead .....	Alberta .....	CPC
Michaud, Élane .....	Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier.....	Québec .....	NDP
Miller, Larry .....	Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound...	Ontario .....	CPC
Moore, Christine .....	Abitibi—Témiscamingue .....	Québec .....	NDP

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Moore, Hon. James, Minister of Industry	Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam	British Columbia	CPC
Moore, Hon. Rob, Minister of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)	Fundy Royal	New Brunswick	CPC
Morin, Dany	Chicoutimi—Le Fjord	Québec	NDP
Morin, Isabelle	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine	Québec	NDP
Morin, Marc-André	Laurentides—Labelle	Québec	NDP
Morin, Marie-Claude	Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot	Québec	NDP
Mourani, Maria	Ahuntsic	Québec	Ind.
Mulcair, Hon. Thomas, Leader of the Opposition	Outremont	Québec	NDP
Murray, Joyce	Vancouver Quadra	British Columbia	Lib.
Nantel, Pierre	Longueuil—Pierre-Boucher	Québec	NDP
Nash, Peggy	Parkdale—High Park	Ontario	NDP
Nicholls, Jamie	Vaudreuil-Soulanges	Québec	NDP
Nicholson, Hon. Rob, Minister of National Defence	Niagara Falls	Ontario	CPC
Norlock, Rick	Northumberland—Quinte West	Ontario	CPC
Nunez-Melo, José	Laval	Québec	NDP
Obhrai, Hon. Deepak, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs and for International Human Rights	Calgary East	Alberta	CPC
O'Connor, Hon. Gordon	Carleton—Mississippi Mills	Ontario	CPC
Oliver, Hon. Joe, Minister of Natural Resources	Eglinton—Lawrence	Ontario	CPC
O'Neill Gordon, Tilly	Miramichi	New Brunswick	CPC
Opitz, Ted	Etobicoke Centre	Ontario	CPC
O'Toole, Erin, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade	Durham	Ontario	CPC
Pacetti, Massimo	Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel	Québec	Lib.
Papillon, Annick	Québec	Québec	NDP
Paradis, Hon. Christian, Minister of International Development and Minister for La Francophonie	Mégantic—L'Érable	Québec	CPC
Patry, Claude	Jonquière—Alma	Québec	BQ
Payne, LaVar	Medicine Hat	Alberta	CPC
Péclet, Ève	La Pointe-de-l'Île	Québec	NDP
Perreault, Manon	Montcalm	Québec	NDP
Pilon, François	Laval—Les Îles	Québec	NDP
Plamondon, Louis	Bas-Richelieu—Nicolet—Bécancour	Québec	BQ
Poilievre, Hon. Pierre, Minister of State (Democratic Reform)	Nepean—Carleton	Ontario	CPC
Preston, Joe	Elgin—Middlesex—London	Ontario	CPC
Quach, Anne Minh-Thu	Beauharnois—Salaberry	Québec	NDP
Rafferty, John	Thunder Bay—Rainy River	Ontario	NDP
Raitt, Hon. Lisa, Minister of Transport	Halton	Ontario	CPC
Rajotte, James	Edmonton—Leduc	Alberta	CPC
Rankin, Murray	Victoria	British Columbia	NDP
Rathgeber, Brent	Edmonton—St. Albert	Alberta	Ind.
Ravignat, Mathieu	Pontiac	Québec	NDP
Raynault, Francine	Joliette	Québec	NDP
Regan, Hon. Geoff	Halifax West	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Reid, Scott	Lanark—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington	Ontario	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Rempel, Hon. Michelle, Minister of State (Western Economic Diversification)	Calgary Centre-North	Alberta	CPC
Richards, Blake	Wild Rose	Alberta	CPC
Rickford, Hon. Greg, Minister of State (Science and Technology, and Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario)	Kenora	Ontario	CPC
Ritz, Hon. Gerry, Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Battlefords—Lloydminster	Saskatchewan	CPC
Rousseau, Jean	Compton—Stanstead	Québec	NDP
Saganash, Romeo	Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou	Québec	NDP
Sandhu, Jasbir	Surrey North	British Columbia	NDP
Saxton, Andrew, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance	North Vancouver	British Columbia	CPC
Scarpaleggia, Francis	Lac-Saint-Louis	Québec	Lib.
Scheer, Hon. Andrew, Speaker of the House of Commons	Regina—Qu'Appelle	Saskatchewan	CPC
Schellenberger, Gary	Perth—Wellington	Ontario	CPC
Scott, Craig	Toronto—Danforth	Ontario	NDP
Seeback, Kyle	Brampton West	Ontario	CPC
Sellah, Djaouida	Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert	Québec	NDP
Sgro, Hon. Judy	York West	Ontario	Lib.
Shea, Hon. Gail, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Egmont	Prince Edward Island	CPC
Shipley, Bev	Lambton—Kent—Middlesex	Ontario	CPC
Shory, Devinder	Calgary Northeast	Alberta	CPC
Simms, Scott	Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor	Newfoundland and Labrador	Lib.
Sims, Jinny Jogindera	Newton—North Delta	British Columbia	NDP
Sitsabaiesan, Rathika	Scarborough—Rouge River	Ontario	NDP
Smith, Joy	Kildonan—St. Paul	Manitoba	CPC
Sopuck, Robert	Dauphin—Swan River—Marquette	Manitoba	CPC
Sorenson, Hon. Kevin, Minister of State (Finance)	Crowfoot	Alberta	CPC
Stanton, Bruce, The Acting Speaker	Simcoe North	Ontario	CPC
St-Denis, Lise	Saint-Maurice—Champlain	Québec	Lib.
Stewart, Kennedy	Burnaby—Douglas	British Columbia	NDP
Stoffer, Peter	Sackville—Eastern Shore	Nova Scotia	NDP
Storseth, Brian	Westlock—St. Paul	Alberta	CPC
Strahl, Mark, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development	Chilliwack—Fraser Canyon	British Columbia	CPC
Sullivan, Mike	York South—Weston	Ontario	NDP
Sweet, David	Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Westdale	Ontario	CPC
Thibeault, Glenn	Sudbury	Ontario	NDP
Tilson, David	Dufferin—Caledon	Ontario	CPC
Toet, Lawrence	Elmwood—Transcona	Manitoba	CPC
Toone, Philip	Gaspésie—Îles-de-la-Madeleine	Québec	NDP
Tremblay, Jonathan	Montmorency—Charlevoix—Haute-Côte-Nord	Québec	NDP
Trost, Brad	Saskatoon—Humboldt	Saskatchewan	CPC
Trottier, Bernard, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Etobicoke—Lakeshore	Ontario	CPC
Trudeau, Justin	Papineau	Québec	Lib.
Truppe, Susan, Parliamentary Secretary for Status of Women	London North Centre	Ontario	CPC
Turmel, Nycole	Hull—Aylmer	Québec	NDP

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Uppal, Hon. Tim, Minister of State (Multiculturalism)	Edmonton—Sherwood Park	Alberta	CPC
Valcourt, Hon. Bernard, Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development	Madawaska—Restigouche	New Brunswick	CPC
Valeriote, Frank	Guelph	Ontario	Lib.
Van Kesteren, Dave	Chatham-Kent—Essex	Ontario	CPC
Van Loan, Hon. Peter, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	York—Simcoe	Ontario	CPC
Vellacott, Maurice	Saskatoon—Wanuskewin	Saskatchewan	CPC
Wallace, Mike	Burlington	Ontario	CPC
Warawa, Mark	Langley	British Columbia	CPC
Warkentin, Chris	Peace River	Alberta	CPC
Watson, Jeff, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport	Essex	Ontario	CPC
Weston, John	West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country	British Columbia	CPC
Weston, Rodney	Saint John	New Brunswick	CPC
Wilks, David	Kootenay—Columbia	British Columbia	CPC
Williamson, John	New Brunswick Southwest	New Brunswick	CPC
Wong, Hon. Alice, Minister of State (Seniors)	Richmond	British Columbia	CPC
Woodworth, Stephen	Kitchener Centre	Ontario	CPC
Yelich, Hon. Lynne, Minister of State (Foreign Affairs and Consular)	Blackstrap	Saskatchewan	CPC
Young, Terence	Oakville	Ontario	CPC
Young, Wai	Vancouver South	British Columbia	CPC
Zimmer, Bob	Prince George—Peace River	British Columbia	CPC
VACANCY	Bourassa	Québec	
VACANCY	Toronto Centre	Ontario	
VACANCY	Brandon—Souris	Manitoba	
VACANCY	Provencher	Manitoba	
VACANCY	Macleod	Alberta	

## ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS BY PROVINCE

## Second Session—Forty-first Parliament

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
<b>ALBERTA (27)</b>		
Ablonczy, Hon. Diane	Calgary—Nose Hill	CPC
Ambrose, Hon. Rona, Minister of Health	Edmonton—Spruce Grove	CPC
Anders, Rob	Calgary West	CPC
Benoit, Leon	Vegreville—Wainwright	CPC
Calkins, Blaine	Wetaskiwin	CPC
Crockatt, Joan	Calgary Centre	CPC
Dreeshen, Earl	Red Deer	CPC
Duncan, Linda	Edmonton—Strathcona	NDP
Goldring, Peter	Edmonton East	CPC
Harper, Right Hon. Stephen, Prime Minister	Calgary Southwest	CPC
Hawn, Hon. Laurie	Edmonton Centre	CPC
Hillyer, Jim	Lethbridge	CPC
Jean, Brian	Fort McMurray—Athabasca	CPC
Kenney, Hon. Jason, Minister of Employment and Social Development and Minister for Multiculturalism	Calgary Southeast	CPC
Lake, Hon. Mike, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry	Edmonton—Mill Woods—Beaumont	CPC
Merrifield, Hon. Rob	Yellowhead	CPC
Obhrai, Hon. Deepak, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs and for International Human Rights	Calgary East	CPC
Payne, LaVar	Medicine Hat	CPC
Rajotte, James	Edmonton—Leduc	CPC
Rathgeber, Brent	Edmonton—St. Albert	Ind.
Rempel, Hon. Michelle, Minister of State (Western Economic Diversification)	Calgary Centre-North	CPC
Richards, Blake	Wild Rose	CPC
Shory, Devinder	Calgary Northeast	CPC
Sorenson, Hon. Kevin, Minister of State (Finance)	Crowfoot	CPC
Storseth, Brian	Westlock—St. Paul	CPC
Uppal, Hon. Tim, Minister of State (Multiculturalism)	Edmonton—Sherwood Park	CPC
Warkentin, Chris	Peace River	CPC
VACANCY	Macleod	
<b>BRITISH COLUMBIA (36)</b>		
Albas, Dan, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board	Okanagan—Coquihalla	CPC
Atamanenko, Alex	British Columbia Southern Interior	NDP
Cannan, Hon. Ron	Kelowna—Lake Country	CPC
Crowder, Jean	Nanaimo—Cowichan	NDP
Cullen, Nathan	Skeena—Bulkley Valley	NDP
Davies, Don	Vancouver Kingsway	NDP
Davies, Libby	Vancouver East	NDP
Donnelly, Fin	New Westminster—Coquitlam	NDP
Duncan, Hon. John, Minister of State and Chief Government Whip	Vancouver Island North	CPC
Fast, Hon. Ed, Minister of International Trade	Abbotsford	CPC
Findlay, Hon. Kerry-Lynne D., Minister of National Revenue	Delta—Richmond East	CPC
Fry, Hon. Hedy	Vancouver Centre	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Garrison, Randall	Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca	NDP
Grewal, Nina	Fleetwood—Port Kells	CPC
Harris, Richard	Cariboo—Prince George	CPC
Hiebert, Russ	South Surrey—White Rock—Cloverdale	CPC
Julian, Peter	Burnaby—New Westminster	NDP
Kamp, Randy, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission	CPC
Lunney, James	Nanaimo—Alberni	CPC
May, Elizabeth	Saanich—Gulf Islands	GP
Mayes, Colin	Okanagan—Shuswap	CPC
McLeod, Cathy, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour and for Western Economic Diversification	Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo	CPC
Moore, Hon. James, Minister of Industry	Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam	CPC
Murray, Joyce	Vancouver Quadra	Lib.
Rankin, Murray	Victoria	NDP
Sandhu, Jasbir	Surrey North	NDP
Saxton, Andrew, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance	North Vancouver	CPC
Sims, Jinny Jogindera	Newton—North Delta	NDP
Stewart, Kennedy	Burnaby—Douglas	NDP
Strahl, Mark, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development	Chilliwack—Fraser Canyon	CPC
Warawa, Mark	Langley	CPC
Weston, John	West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country	CPC
Wilks, David	Kootenay—Columbia	CPC
Wong, Hon. Alice, Minister of State (Seniors)	Richmond	CPC
Young, Wai	Vancouver South	CPC
Zimmer, Bob	Prince George—Peace River	CPC
<b>MANITOBA (12)</b>		
Ashton, Niki	Churchill	NDP
Bateman, Joyce	Winnipeg South Centre	CPC
Bergen, Hon. Candice, Minister of State (Social Development)	Portage—Lisgar	CPC
Bezan, James, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence	Selkirk—Interlake	CPC
Bruinooge, Rod	Winnipeg South	CPC
Fletcher, Hon. Steven	Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia	CPC
Glover, Hon. Shelly, Minister of Canadian Heritage and Official Languages	Saint Boniface	CPC
Lamoureux, Kevin	Winnipeg North	Lib.
Martin, Pat	Winnipeg Centre	NDP
Smith, Joy	Kildonan—St. Paul	CPC
Sopuck, Robert	Dauphin—Swan River—Marquette	CPC
Toet, Lawrence	Elmwood—Transcona	CPC
VACANCY	Brandon—Souris	
VACANCY	Provencher	
<b>NEW BRUNSWICK (10)</b>		
Allen, Mike	Tobique—Mactaquac	CPC
Ashfield, Hon. Keith	Fredericton	CPC
Godin, Yvon	Acadie—Bathurst	NDP
Goguen, Robert, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice	Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe	CPC



Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
LeBlanc, Hon. Dominic	Beauséjour	Lib.
Moore, Hon. Rob, Minister of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)	Fundy Royal	CPC
O'Neill Gordon, Tilly	Miramichi	CPC
Valcourt, Hon. Bernard, Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development	Madawaska—Restigouche	CPC
Weston, Rodney	Saint John	CPC
Williamson, John	New Brunswick Southwest	CPC

#### NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR (7)

Andrews, Scott	Avalon	Lib.
Byrne, Hon. Gerry	Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte	Lib.
Cleary, Ryan	St. John's South—Mount Pearl	NDP
Foote, Judy	Random—Burin—St. George's	Lib.
Harris, Jack	St. John's East	NDP
Jones, Yvonne	Labrador	Lib.
Simms, Scott	Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor	Lib.

#### NORTHWEST TERRITORIES (1)

Bevington, Dennis	Western Arctic	NDP
-------------------	----------------	-----

#### NOVA SCOTIA (11)

Armstrong, Scott, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Employment and Social Development	Cumberland—Colchester—Musquodoboit Valley	CPC
Brison, Hon. Scott	Kings—Hants	Lib.
Chisholm, Robert	Dartmouth—Cole Harbour	NDP
Cuzner, Rodger	Cape Breton—Canso	Lib.
Eyking, Hon. Mark	Sydney—Victoria	Lib.
Keddy, Gerald, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Revenue and for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency	South Shore—St. Margaret's	CPC
Kerr, Greg	West Nova	CPC
Leslie, Megan	Halifax	NDP
MacKay, Hon. Peter, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Central Nova	CPC
Regan, Hon. Geoff	Halifax West	Lib.
Stoffer, Peter	Sackville—Eastern Shore	NDP

#### NUNAVUT (1)

Aglukkaq, Hon. Leona, Minister of the Environment, Minister of the Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency and Minister for the Arctic Council	Nunavut	CPC
--	---------	-----

#### ONTARIO (105)

Adams, Eve, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health	Mississauga—Brampton South	CPC
Adler, Mark	York Centre	CPC
Albrecht, Harold	Kitchener—Conestoga	CPC
Alexander, Hon. Chris, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Ajax—Pickering	CPC
Allen, Malcolm	Welland	NDP
Allison, Dean	Niagara West—Glanbrook	CPC
Ambler, Stella	Mississauga South	CPC
Angus, Charlie	Timmins—James Bay	NDP
Aspin, Jay	Nipissing—Timiskaming	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Baird, Hon. John, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Ottawa West—Nepean	CPC
Bélanger, Hon. Mauril	Ottawa—Vanier	Lib.
Bennett, Hon. Carolyn	St. Paul's	Lib.
Braid, Peter, Parliamentary Secretary for Infrastructure and Communities	Kitchener—Waterloo	CPC
Brown, Gordon	Leeds—Grenville	CPC
Brown, Lois, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Development	Newmarket—Aurora	CPC
Brown, Patrick	Barrie	CPC
Butt, Brad	Mississauga—Streetsville	CPC
Calandra, Paul, Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs	Oak Ridges—Markham	CPC
Carmichael, John	Don Valley West	CPC
Carrie, Colin, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment	Oshawa	CPC
Cash, Andrew	Davenport	NDP
Charlton, Chris	Hamilton Mountain	NDP
Chisu, Corneliu	Pickering—Scarborough East	CPC
Chong, Hon. Michael	Wellington—Halton Hills	CPC
Chow, Olivia	Trinity—Spadina	NDP
Christopherson, David	Hamilton Centre	NDP
Clement, Hon. Tony, President of the Treasury Board	Parry Sound—Muskoka	CPC
Comartin, Joe, The Deputy Speaker	Windsor—Tecumseh	NDP
Daniel, Joe	Don Valley East	CPC
Davidson, Patricia	Sarnia—Lambton	CPC
Dechert, Bob, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice	Mississauga—Erindale	CPC
Del Mastro, Dean	Peterborough	Cons. Ind.
Devolin, Barry, The Acting Speaker	Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brock	CPC
Dewar, Paul	Ottawa Centre	NDP
Duncan, Kirsty	Etobicoke North	Lib.
Dykstra, Rick, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage	St. Catharines	CPC
Fantino, Hon. Julian, Minister of Veterans Affairs	Vaughan	CPC
Finley, Hon. Diane, Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Haldimand—Norfolk	CPC
Flaherty, Hon. Jim, Minister of Finance	Whitby—Oshawa	CPC
Galipeau, Royal	Ottawa—Orléans	CPC
Gallant, Cheryl	Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke	CPC
Gill, Parm, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs	Brampton—Springdale	CPC
Goodyear, Hon. Gary, Minister of State (Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario)	Cambridge	CPC
Gosal, Hon. Bal, Minister of State (Sport)	Bramalea—Gore—Malton	CPC
Gravelle, Claude	Nickel Belt	NDP
Harris, Dan	Scarborough Southwest	NDP
Hayes, Bryan	Sault Ste. Marie	CPC
Holder, Ed	London West	CPC
Hsu, Ted	Kingston and the Islands	Lib.
Hughes, Carol	Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapuskasing	NDP
Hyer, Bruce	Thunder Bay—Superior North	Ind.
James, Roxanne, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness	Scarborough Centre	CPC
Karygiannis, Hon. Jim	Scarborough—Agincourt	Lib.
Kellway, Matthew	Beaches—East York	NDP
Kent, Hon. Peter	Thornhill	CPC
Kramp, Daryl	Prince Edward—Hastings	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Lauzon, Guy	Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry	CPC
Leitch, Hon. Kellie, Minister of Labour and Minister of Status of Women	Simcoe—Grey	CPC
Lemieux, Pierre, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture	Glengarry—Prescott—Russell	CPC
Leung, Chungsen, Parliamentary Secretary for Multiculturalism	Willowdale	CPC
Lizon, Wladyslaw	Mississauga East—Cooksville	CPC
Lobb, Ben	Huron—Bruce	CPC
MacKenzie, Dave	Oxford	CPC
Marston, Wayne	Hamilton East—Stoney Creek	NDP
Masse, Brian	Windsor West	NDP
Mathyssen, Irene	London—Fanshawe	NDP
McCallum, Hon. John	Markham—Unionville	Lib.
McColeman, Phil	Brant	CPC
McGuinty, David	Ottawa South	Lib.
McKay, Hon. John	Scarborough—Guildwood	Lib.
Menegakis, Costas, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Richmond Hill	CPC
Miller, Larry	Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound	CPC
Nash, Peggy	Parkdale—High Park	NDP
Nicholson, Hon. Rob, Minister of National Defence	Niagara Falls	CPC
Norlock, Rick	Northumberland—Quinte West	CPC
O'Connor, Hon. Gordon	Carleton—Mississippi Mills	CPC
Oliver, Hon. Joe, Minister of Natural Resources	Eglinton—Lawrence	CPC
Oritz, Ted	Etobicoke Centre	CPC
O'Toole, Erin, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade	Durham	CPC
Poillievre, Hon. Pierre, Minister of State (Democratic Reform)	Nepean—Carleton	CPC
Preston, Joe	Elgin—Middlesex—London	CPC
Rafferty, John	Thunder Bay—Rainy River	NDP
Raitt, Hon. Lisa, Minister of Transport	Halton	CPC
Reid, Scott	Lanark—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington	CPC
Rickford, Hon. Greg, Minister of State (Science and Technology, and Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario)	Kenora	CPC
Schellenberger, Gary	Perth—Wellington	CPC
Scott, Craig	Toronto—Danforth	NDP
Seeback, Kyle	Brampton West	CPC
Sgro, Hon. Judy	York West	Lib.
Shiple, Bev	Lambton—Kent—Middlesex	CPC
Sitsabaiesan, Rathika	Scarborough—Rouge River	NDP
Stanton, Bruce, The Acting Speaker	Simcoe North	CPC
Sullivan, Mike	York South—Weston	NDP
Sweet, David	Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Westdale	CPC
Thibeault, Glenn	Sudbury	NDP
Tilson, David	Dufferin—Caledon	CPC
Trottier, Bernard, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Etobicoke—Lakeshore	CPC
Truppe, Susan, Parliamentary Secretary for Status of Women	London North Centre	CPC
Valeriote, Frank	Guelph	Lib.
Van Kesteren, Dave	Chatham-Kent—Essex	CPC
Van Loan, Hon. Peter, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	York—Simcoe	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Wallace, Mike	Burlington	CPC
Watson, Jeff, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport	Essex	CPC
Woodworth, Stephen	Kitchener Centre	CPC
Young, Terence	Oakville	CPC
VACANCY	Toronto Centre	
<b>PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND (4)</b>		
Casey, Sean	Charlottetown	Lib.
Easter, Hon. Wayne	Malpeque	Lib.
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence	Cardigan	Lib.
Shea, Hon. Gail, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Egmont	CPC
<b>QUÉBEC (74)</b>		
Aubin, Robert	Trois-Rivières	NDP
Ayala, Paulina	Honoré-Mercier	NDP
Bellavance, André	Richmond—Arthabaska	BQ
Benskin, Tyrone	Jeanne-Le Ber	NDP
Bernier, Hon. Maxime, Minister of State (Small Business and Tourism, and Agriculture)	Beauce	CPC
Blanchette, Denis	Louis-Hébert	NDP
Blanchette-Lamothe, Lysane	Pierrefonds—Dollard	NDP
Blaney, Hon. Steven, Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness	Lévis—Bellechasse	CPC
Boivin, Françoise	Gatineau	NDP
Borg, Charmaine	Terrebonne—Blainville	NDP
Boulerice, Alexandre	Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie	NDP
Boutin-Sweet, Marjolaine	Hochelaga	NDP
Brahmi, Tarik	Saint-Jean	NDP
Brosseau, Ruth Ellen	Berthier—Maskinongé	NDP
Caron, Guy	Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques	NDP
Chicoine, Sylvain	Châteauguay—Saint-Constant	NDP
Choquette, François	Drummond	NDP
Côté, Raymond	Beauport—Limoilou	NDP
Cotler, Hon. Irwin	Mount Royal	Lib.
Day, Anne-Marie	Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles	NDP
Dion, Hon. Stéphane, Saint-Laurent—Cartierville	Saint-Laurent—Cartierville	Lib.
Dionne Labelle, Pierre	Rivière-du-Nord	NDP
Doré Lefebvre, Rosane	Alfred-Pellan	NDP
Dubé, Matthew	Chambly—Borduas	NDP
Dusseault, Pierre-Luc	Sherbrooke	NDP
Fortin, Jean-François	Haute-Gaspésie—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia	BQ
Freeman, Mylène	Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel	NDP
Garneau, Marc	Westmount—Ville-Marie	Lib.
Genest, Réjean	Shefford	NDP
Genest-Jourdain, Jonathan	Manicouagan	NDP
Giguère, Alain	Marc-Aurèle-Fortin	NDP
Gourde, Jacques, Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, for Official Languages and for the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec	Lotbinière—Chutes-de-la-Chaudière	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Groguhé, Sadia	Saint-Lambert	NDP
Hassainia, Sana	Verchères—Les Patriotes	NDP
Jacob, Pierre	Brome—Missisquoi	NDP
Lapointe, François	Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska— Rivière-du-Loup	NDP
Larose, Jean-François	Repentigny	NDP
Latendresse, Alexandrine	Louis-Saint-Laurent	NDP
Laverdière, Hélène	Laurier—Sainte-Marie	NDP
Label, Hon. Denis, Minister of Infrastructure, Communities and Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister of the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec	Roberval—Lac-Saint-Jean	CPC
LeBlanc, Hélène	LaSalle—Émard	NDP
Liu, Laurin	Rivière-des-Mille-Îles	NDP
Mai, Hoang	Brossard—La Prairie	NDP
Michaud, Élane	Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier	NDP
Moore, Christine	Abitibi—Témiscamingue	NDP
Morin, Dany	Chicoutimi—Le Fjord	NDP
Morin, Isabelle	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine	NDP
Morin, Marc-André	Laurentides—Labelle	NDP
Morin, Marie-Claude	Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot	NDP
Mourani, Maria	Ahuntsic	Ind.
Mulcair, Hon. Thomas, Leader of the Opposition	Outremont	NDP
Nantel, Pierre	Longueuil—Pierre-Boucher	NDP
Nicholls, Jamie	Vaudreuil-Soulanges	NDP
Nunez-Melo, José	Laval	NDP
Pacetti, Massimo	Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel	Lib.
Papillon, Annick	Québec	NDP
Paradis, Hon. Christian, Minister of International Development and Minister for La Francophonie	Mégantic—L'Érable	CPC
Patry, Claude	Jonquière—Alma	BQ
Péclet, Ève	La Pointe-de-l'Île	NDP
Perreault, Manon	Montcalm	NDP
Pilon, François	Laval—Les Îles	NDP
Plamondon, Louis	Bas-Richelieu—Nicolet—Bécancour	BQ
Quach, Anne Minh-Thu	Beauharnois—Salaberry	NDP
Ravignat, Mathieu	Pontiac	NDP
Raynault, Francine	Joliette	NDP
Rousseau, Jean	Compton—Stanstead	NDP
Saganash, Romeo	Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou	NDP
Scarpaleggia, Francis	Lac-Saint-Louis	Lib.
Sellah, Djaouida	Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert	NDP
St-Denis, Lise	Saint-Maurice—Champlain	Lib.
Toone, Philip	Gaspésie—Îles-de-la-Madeleine	NDP
Tremblay, Jonathan	Montmorency—Charlevoix—Haute- Côte-Nord	NDP
Trudeau, Justin	Papineau	Lib.
Turmel, Nycole	Hull—Aylmer	NDP
VACANCY	Bourassa	

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
<b>SASKATCHEWAN (14)</b>		
Anderson, David, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs .....	Cypress Hills—Grasslands .....	CPC
Block, Kelly, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources .....	Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar .....	CPC
Boughen, Ray .....	Palliser .....	CPC
Breitkreuz, Garry .....	Yorkton—Melville .....	CPC
Clarke, Rob .....	Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill River ..	CPC
Goodale, Hon. Ralph .....	Wascana .....	Lib.
Hoback, Randy .....	Prince Albert .....	CPC
Komarnicki, Ed .....	Souris—Moose Mountain .....	CPC
Lukiwski, Tom, Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons .....	Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre .....	CPC
Ritz, Hon. Gerry, Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food .....	Battlefords—Lloydminster .....	CPC
Scheer, Hon. Andrew, Speaker of the House of Commons .....	Regina—Qu'Appelle .....	CPC
Trost, Brad .....	Saskatoon—Humboldt .....	CPC
Vellacott, Maurice .....	Saskatoon—Wanuskewin .....	CPC
Yelich, Hon. Lynne, Minister of State (Foreign Affairs and Consular) .....	Blackstrap .....	CPC
<b>YUKON (1)</b>		
Leef, Ryan .....	Yukon .....	CPC

## LIST OF STANDING AND SUB-COMMITTEES

(As of November 22, 2013 — 2nd Session, 41st Parliament)

### ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

**Chair:**

Chris Warkentin

**Vice-Chairs:**

Carolyn Bennett  
Jean Crowder

Diane Ablonczy  
Dennis Bevington  
Ray Boughen

Rob Clarke  
Jonathan Genest-Jourdain

Jim Hillyer  
Carol Hughes

Kyle Seeback  
Mark Strahl

(12)

#### Associate Members

Eve Adams  
Mark Adler  
Dan Albas  
Harold Albrecht  
Mike Allen  
Dean Allison  
Stella Ambler  
Rob Anders  
David Anderson  
Charlie Angus  
Scott Armstrong  
Keith Ashfield  
Niki Ashton  
Jay Aspin  
Joyce Bateman  
Leon Benoit  
Tyrone Benskin  
James Bezan  
Kelly Block  
Peter Braid  
Garry Breitkreuz  
Gordon Brown  
Lois Brown  
Patrick Brown  
Rod Bruinooge  
Brad Butt  
Paul Calandra  
Blaine Calkins  
Ron Cannan  
John Carmichael

Colin Carrie  
Corneliu Chisu  
Michael Chong  
Joan Crockatt  
Nathan Cullen  
Joe Daniel  
Patricia Davidson  
Bob Dechert  
Earl Dreesen  
Rick Dykstra  
Steven Fletcher  
Royal Galipeau  
Cheryl Gallant  
Parm Gill  
Robert Goguen  
Peter Goldring  
Jacques Gourde  
Nina Grewal  
Richard Harris  
Laurie Hawn  
Bryan Hayes  
Russ Hiebert  
Randy Hoback  
Ed Holder  
Roxanne James  
Brian Jean  
Peter Julian  
Randy Kamp  
Gerald Keddy  
Peter Kent

Greg Kerr  
Ed Komarnicki  
Daryl Kramp  
Mike Lake  
Guy Lauzon  
Ryan Leef  
Pierre Lemieux  
Chungsen Leung  
Wladyslaw Lizon  
Ben Lobb  
Tom Lukiwski  
James Lunney  
Dave MacKenzie  
Colin Mayes  
Phil McColeman  
Cathy McLeod  
Costas Menegakis  
Ted Menzies  
Rob Merrifield  
Larry Miller  
Rick Norlock  
Deepak Obhrai  
Gordon O'Connor  
Tilly O'Neill Gordon  
Ted Opitz  
Erin O'Toole  
LaVar Payne  
Joe Preston  
James Rajotte  
Mathieu Ravignat

Scott Reid  
Blake Richards  
Romeo Saganash  
Andrew Saxton  
Gary Schellenberger  
Bev Shipley  
Devinder Shory  
Joy Smith  
Robert Sopuck  
Brian Storseth  
David Sweet  
David Tilson  
Lawrence Toet  
Brad Trost  
Bernard Trotter  
Susan Truppe  
Dave Van Kesteren  
Maurice Vellacott  
Mike Wallace  
Mark Warawa  
Jeff Watson  
John Weston  
Rodney Weston  
David Wilks  
John Williamson  
Stephen Woodworth  
Terence Young  
Wai Young  
Bob Zimmer

## ACCESS TO INFORMATION, PRIVACY AND ETHICS

**Chair:**

Pat Martin

**Vice-Chairs:**
Scott Andrews  
Patricia DavidsonCharlie Angus  
Charmaine Borg  
Paul CalandraJohn Carmichael  
Earl DreeshenJacques Gourde  
Colin MayesTilly O'Neill Gordon  
Mathieu Ravignat

(12)

### Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy  
Eve Adams  
Mark Adler  
Dan Albas  
Harold Albrecht  
Mike Allen  
Dean Allison  
Stella Ambler  
Rob Anders  
David Anderson  
Scott Armstrong  
Keith Ashfield  
Jay Aspin  
Joyce Bateman  
Leon Benoit  
James Bezan  
Kelly Block  
Ray Boughen  
Peter Braid  
Garry Breitzkreuz  
Gordon Brown  
Lois Brown  
Patrick Brown  
Rod Bruinooge  
Brad Butt  
Blaine Calkins  
Ron Cannan  
Colin Carrie  
Corneliu ChisuMichael Chong  
David Christopherson  
Rob Clarke  
Joan Crockatt  
Joe Daniel  
Bob Dechert  
Pierre-Luc Dusseault  
Rick Dykstra  
Steven Fletcher  
Royal Galipeau  
Cheryl Gallant  
Parm Gill  
Robert Goguen  
Peter Goldring  
Nina Grewal  
Richard Harris  
Laurie Hawn  
Bryan Hayes  
Russ Hiebert  
Jim Hillyer  
Randy Hoback  
Ed Holder  
Roxanne James  
Brian Jean  
Peter Julian  
Randy Kamp  
Gerald Keddy  
Peter Kent  
Greg KerrEd Komarnicki  
Daryl Kramp  
Mike Lake  
Guy Lauzon  
Ryan Leef  
Pierre Lemieux  
Chungsen Leung  
Wladyslaw Lizon  
Ben Lobb  
Tom Lukiwski  
James Lunney  
Dave MacKenzie  
Phil McColeman  
Cathy McLeod  
Costas Menegakis  
Ted Menzies  
Rob Merrifield  
Larry Miller  
Rick Norlock  
Deepak Obhrai  
Gordon O'Connor  
Ted Opitz  
Erin O'Toole  
LaVar Payne  
Joe Preston  
James Rajotte  
Scott Reid  
Blake Richards  
Andrew SaxtonGary Schellenberger  
Craig Scott  
Kyle Seeback  
Bev Shipley  
Devinder Shory  
Joy Smith  
Robert Sopuck  
Brian Storseth  
Mark Strahl  
David Sweet  
David Tilson  
Lawrence Toet  
Brad Trost  
Bernard Trotter  
Susan Truppe  
Dave Van Kesteren  
Maurice Vellacott  
Mike Wallace  
Mark Warawa  
Chris Warkentin  
Jeff Watson  
John Weston  
Rodney Weston  
David Wilks  
John Williamson  
Stephen Woodworth  
Terence Young  
Wai Young  
Bob Zimmer



## AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

<b>Chair:</b>	Bev Shipley	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	Malcolm Allen Mark Eyking	
Alex Atamanenko Ruth Ellen Brosseau Richard Harris	Randy Hoback Pierre Lemieux	LaVar Payne Joe Preston	Francine Raynault Bob Zimmer	(12)

### Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy	Colin Carrie	Gerald Keddy	Scott Reid
Eve Adams	Corneliu Chisu	Peter Kent	Blake Richards
Mark Adler	Michael Chong	Greg Kerr	Andrew Saxton
Dan Albas	Rob Clarke	Ed Komarnicki	Gary Schellenberger
Harold Albrecht	Joan Crockatt	Daryl Kramp	Kyle Seeback
Mike Allen	Joe Daniel	Mike Lake	Devinder Shory
Dean Allison	Patricia Davidson	Guy Lauzon	Joy Smith
Stella Ambler	Bob Dechert	Ryan Leef	Robert Sopuck
Rob Anders	Earl Dreesen	Chungsen Leung	Brian Storseth
David Anderson	Linda Duncan	Wladyslaw Lizon	Mark Strahl
Scott Armstrong	Rick Dykstra	Ben Lobb	David Sweet
Keith Ashfield	Steven Fletcher	Tom Lukiwski	David Tilson
Niki Ashton	Royal Galipeau	James Lunney	Lawrence Toet
Jay Aspin	Cheryl Gallant	Dave MacKenzie	Brad Trost
Joyce Bateman	Parm Gill	Pat Martin	Bernard Trottier
Leon Benoit	Robert Goguen	Colin Mayes	Susan Truppe
James Bezan	Peter Goldring	Phil McColeman	Dave Van Kesteren
Kelly Block	Jacques Gourde	Cathy McLeod	Maurice Vellacott
Ray Boughen	Nina Grewal	Costas Menegakis	Mike Wallace
Peter Braid	Laurie Hawn	Ted Menzies	Mark Warawa
Garry Breitzkreuz	Bryan Hayes	Rob Merrifield	Chris Warkentin
Gordon Brown	Russ Hiebert	Larry Miller	Jeff Watson
Lois Brown	Jim Hillyer	Rick Norlock	John Weston
Patrick Brown	Ed Holder	Deepak Obhrai	Rodney Weston
Rod Bruinooge	Carol Hughes	Gordon O'Connor	David Wilks
Brad Butt	Roxanne James	Tilly O'Neill Gordon	John Williamson
Paul Calandra	Brian Jean	Ted Opitz	Stephen Woodworth
Blaine Calkins	Peter Julian	Erin O'Toole	Terence Young
Ron Cannan	Randy Kamp	James Rajotte	Wai Young
John Carmichael			

---

## CANADIAN HERITAGE

**Chair:**

Gordon Brown

**Vice-Chairs:**

Stéphane Dion

Pierre Nantel

Ray Boughen  
Matthew Dubé  
Rick Dykstra

Jim Hillyer  
François Lapointe

Chungsen Leung  
Irene Mathysen

Blake Richards  
Terence Young

(12)

### Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy  
Eve Adams  
Mark Adler  
Dan Albas  
Harold Albrecht  
Mike Allen  
Dean Allison  
Stella Ambler  
Rob Anders  
David Anderson  
Charlie Angus  
Scott Armstrong  
Keith Ashfield  
Jay Aspin  
Joyce Bateman  
Leon Benoit  
Tyroné Benskin  
James Bezan  
Kelly Block  
Charmaine Borg  
Peter Braid  
Garry Breitreuz  
Lois Brown  
Patrick Brown  
Rod Bruinooge  
Brad Butt  
Paul Calandra  
Blaine Calkins  
Ron Cannan  
John Carmichael

Colin Carrie  
Andrew Cash  
Corneliu Chisu  
Michael Chong  
Rob Clarke  
Joan Crockatt  
Nathan Cullen  
Joe Daniel  
Patricia Davidson  
Bob Dechert  
Earl Dreeshen  
Steven Fletcher  
Royal Galipeau  
Cheryl Gallant  
Parm Gill  
Robert Goguen  
Peter Goldring  
Jacques Gourde  
Nina Grewal  
Richard Harris  
Laurie Hawn  
Bryan Hayes  
Russ Hiebert  
Randy Hoback  
Ed Holder  
Roxanne James  
Brian Jean  
Peter Julian  
Randy Kamp  
Gerald Keddy

Peter Kent  
Greg Kerr  
Ed Komarnicki  
Daryl Kramp  
Mike Lake  
Guy Lauzon  
Ryan Leef  
Pierre Lemieux  
Wladyslaw Lizon  
Ben Lobb  
Tom Lukiwski  
James Lunney  
Dave MacKenzie  
Colin Mayes  
Phil McColeman  
Cathy McLeod  
Costas Menegakis  
Ted Menzies  
Rob Merrifield  
Larry Miller  
Rick Norlock  
Deepak Obhrai  
Gordon O'Connor  
Tilly O'Neill Gordon  
Ted Opitz  
Erin O'Toole  
LaVar Payne  
Joe Preston  
James Rajotte

Scott Reid  
Andrew Saxton  
Gary Schellenberger  
Kyle Seeback  
Bev Shipley  
Devinder Shory  
Joy Smith  
Robert Sopuck  
Brian Storseth  
Mark Strahl  
David Sweet  
David Tilson  
Lawrence Toet  
Brad Trost  
Bernard Trotter  
Susan Truppe  
Dave Van Kesteren  
Maurice Vellacott  
Mike Wallace  
Mark Warawa  
Chris Warkentin  
Jeff Watson  
John Weston  
Rodney Weston  
David Wilks  
John Williamson  
Stephen Woodworth  
Wai Young  
Bob Zimmer



## ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

**Chair:**

Harold Albrecht

**Vice-Chairs:**Megan Leslie  
John McKayRobert Aubin  
Colin Carrie  
François ChoquetteMylène Freeman  
James LunneyRobert Sopuck  
Brian StorsethLawrence Toet  
Stephen Woodworth

(12)

### Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy  
Eve Adams  
Mark Adler  
Dan Albas  
Mike Allen  
Dean Allison  
Stella Ambler  
Rob Anders  
David Anderson  
Scott Armstrong  
Keith Ashfield  
Jay Aspin  
Joyce Bateman  
Leon Benoit  
James Bezan  
Kelly Block  
Ray Boughen  
Peter Braid  
Garry Breitreuz  
Gordon Brown  
Lois Brown  
Patrick Brown  
Rod Bruinooge  
Brad Butt  
Paul Calandra  
Blaine Calkins  
Ron Cannan  
John Carmichael  
Robert ChisholmCorneliu Chisu  
Michael Chong  
Rob Clarke  
Joan Crockatt  
Nathan Cullen  
Joe Daniel  
Patricia Davidson  
Bob Dechert  
Earl Dreshen  
Linda Duncan  
Rick Dykstra  
Steven Fletcher  
Royal Galipeau  
Cheryl Gallant  
Parm Gill  
Robert Goguen  
Peter Goldring  
Jacques Gourde  
Nina Grewal  
Richard Harris  
Laurie Hawn  
Bryan Hayes  
Russ Hiebert  
Jim Hillyer  
Randy Hoback  
Ed Holder  
Roxanne James  
Brian Jean  
Peter JulianRandy Kamp  
Gerald Keddy  
Peter Kent  
Greg Kerr  
Ed Komarnicki  
Daryl Kramp  
Mike Lake  
Guy Lauzon  
Ryan Leef  
Pierre Lemieux  
Chungsen Leung  
Wladyslaw Lizon  
Ben Lobb  
Tom Lukiwski  
Dave MacKenzie  
Colin Mayes  
Phil McColeman  
Cathy McLeod  
Costas Menegakis  
Ted Menzies  
Rob Merrifield  
Larry Miller  
Rick Norlock  
Deepak Obhrai  
Gordon O'Connor  
Tilly O'Neill Gordon  
Ted Opitz  
Erin O'Toole  
LaVar PayneJoe Preston  
James Rajotte  
Scott Reid  
Blake Richards  
Andrew Saxton  
Gary Schellenberger  
Kyle Seeback  
Bev Shipley  
Devinder Shory  
Joy Smith  
Mark Strahl  
David Sweet  
David Tilson  
Brad Trost  
Bernard Trotter  
Susan Truppe  
Dave Van Kesteren  
Maurice Vellacott  
Mike Wallace  
Mark Warawa  
Chris Warkentin  
Jeff Watson  
John Weston  
Rodney Weston  
David Wilks  
John Williamson  
Terence Young  
Wai Young  
Bob Zimmer

## FINANCE

**Chair:** James Rajotte

**Vice-Chairs:**

Scott Brison  
Peggy Nash

Mark Adler  
Guy Caron  
Raymond Côté

Randy Hoback  
Brian Jean

Gerald Keddy  
Murray Rankin

Andrew Saxton  
Dave Van Kesteren

(12)

### Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy	Corneliu Chisu	Ed Holder	Tilly O'Neill Gordon
Eve Adams	Michael Chong	Carol Hughes	Ted Opitz
Dan Albas	François Choquette	Pierre Jacob	Erin O'Toole
Harold Albrecht	Olivia Chow	Roxanne James	LaVar Payne
Malcolm Allen	Rob Clarke	Peter Julian	Manon Perreault
Mike Allen	Joan Crockatt	Randy Kamp	François Pilon
Dean Allison	Jean Crowder	Matthew Kellway	Joe Preston
Stella Ambler	Nathan Cullen	Peter Kent	Anne Minh-Thu Quach
Rob Anders	Joe Daniel	Greg Kerr	Mathieu Ravignat
David Anderson	Patricia Davidson	Ed Komarnicki	Scott Reid
Charlie Angus	Don Davies	Daryl Kramp	Blake Richards
Scott Armstrong	Libby Davies	Mike Lake	Romeo Saganash
Keith Ashfield	Anne-Marie Day	Jean-François Larose	Jasbir Sandhu
Niki Ashton	Bob Dechert	Alexandrine Latendresse	Gary Schellenberger
Jay Aspin	Paul Dewar	Guy Lauzon	Kyle Seeback
Alex Atamanenko	Fin Donnelly	Hélène Laverdière	Djaouida Sellah
Paulina Ayala	Rosane Doré Lefebvre	Hélène LeBlanc	Bev Shipley
Joyce Bateman	Earl Dreeshen	Ryan Leef	Devinder Shory
Leon Benoit	Matthew Dubé	Pierre Lemieux	Rathika Sitsabaiesan
Tyrone Benskin	Linda Duncan	Megan Leslie	Joy Smith
Dennis Bevington	Pierre-Luc Dusseault	Chungsen Leung	Robert Sopuck
James Bezan	Rick Dykstra	Laurin Liu	Kennedy Stewart
Denis Blanchette	Steven Fletcher	Wladyslaw Lizon	Brian Storseth
Lysane Blanchette-Lamothe	Mylène Freeman	Ben Lobb	Mark Strahl
Kelly Block	Royal Galipeau	Tom Lukiwski	David Sweet
Françoise Boivin	Cheryl Gallant	James Lunney	Glenn Thibeault
Charmaine Borg	Randall Garrison	Dave MacKenzie	David Tilson
Ray Boughen	Réjean Genest	Pat Martin	Lawrence Toet
Alexandre Boulerice	Jonathan Genest-Jourdain	Brian Masse	Philip Toone
Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet	Alain Giguère	Irene Mathysen	Brad Trost
Tarik Brahmi	Parm Gill	Colin Mayes	Bernard Trottier
Peter Braid	Yvon Godin	Phil McColeman	Susan Truppe
Garry Breitzkreuz	Robert Goguen	Cathy McLeod	Nycole Turmel
Ruth Ellen Brosseau	Peter Goldring	Costas Menegakis	Maurice Vellacott
Gordon Brown	Jacques Gourde	Ted Menzies	Mike Wallace
Lois Brown	Claude Gravelle	Rob Merrifield	Mark Warawa
Patrick Brown	Nina Grewal	Élaine Michaud	Chris Warkentin
Rod Bruinooge	Sadia Groguhé	Larry Miller	Jeff Watson
Brad Butt	Dan Harris	Dany Morin	John Weston
Paul Calandra	Jack Harris	Isabelle Morin	Rodney Weston
Blaine Calkins	Richard Harris	Marc-André Morin	David Wilks
Ron Cannan	Sana Hassainia	Marie-Claude Morin	John Williamson
John Carmichael	Laurie Hawn	Jamie Nicholls	Stephen Woodworth
Colin Carrie	Bryan Hayes	Rick Norlock	Terence Young
Andrew Cash	Russ Hiebert	Deepak Obhrai	Wai Young
Chris Charlton	Jim Hillyer	Gordon O'Connor	Bob Zimmer
Robert Chisholm			

---

## FISHERIES AND OCEANS

**Chair:** Rodney Weston

**Vice-Chairs:**

Robert Chisholm  
Lawrence MacAulay

Ryan Cleary  
Patricia Davidson  
Fin Donnelly

Randy Kamp  
Greg Kerr

Ryan Leef  
Robert Sopuck

Philip Toone  
John Weston

(12)

### Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy  
Eve Adams  
Mark Adler  
Dan Albas  
Harold Albrecht  
Mike Allen  
Dean Allison  
Stella Ambler  
Rob Anders  
David Anderson  
Scott Armstrong  
Keith Ashfield  
Jay Aspin  
Joyce Bateman  
Leon Benoit  
James Bezan  
Kelly Block  
Ray Boughen  
Peter Braid  
Garry Breitzkreuz  
Gordon Brown  
Lois Brown  
Patrick Brown  
Rod Bruinooge  
Brad Butt  
Paul Calandra  
Blaine Calkins  
Ron Cannan  
John Carmichael

Colin Carrie  
Corneliu Chisu  
Michael Chong  
Rob Clarke  
Joan Crockatt  
Joe Daniel  
Bob Dechert  
Earl Dreeshen  
Rick Dykstra  
Steven Fletcher  
Royal Galipeau  
Cheryl Gallant  
Parm Gill  
Yvon Godin  
Robert Goguen  
Peter Goldring  
Jacques Gourde  
Nina Grewal  
Richard Harris  
Laurie Hawn  
Bryan Hayes  
Russ Hiebert  
Jim Hillyer  
Randy Hoback  
Ed Holder  
Roxanne James  
Brian Jean  
Peter Julian  
Gerald Keddy

Peter Kent  
Ed Komarnicki  
Daryl Kramp  
Mike Lake  
Guy Lauzon  
Pierre Lemieux  
Chungsen Leung  
Wladyslaw Lizon  
Ben Lobb  
Tom Lukiwski  
James Lunney  
Dave MacKenzie  
Colin Mayes  
Phil McColeman  
Cathy McLeod  
Costas Menegakis  
Ted Menzies  
Rob Merrifield  
Larry Miller  
Rick Norlock  
Deepak Obhrai  
Gordon O'Connor  
Tilly O'Neill Gordon  
Ted Opitz  
Erin O'Toole  
LaVar Payne  
Joe Preston  
James Rajotte  
Scott Reid

Blake Richards  
Andrew Saxton  
Gary Schellenberger  
Kyle Seeback  
Bev Shipley  
Devinder Shory  
Joy Smith  
Peter Stoffer  
Brian Storseth  
Mark Strahl  
David Sweet  
David Tilson  
Lawrence Toet  
Jonathan Tremblay  
Brad Trost  
Bernard Trotter  
Susan Truppe  
Dave Van Kesteren  
Maurice Vellacott  
Mike Wallace  
Mark Warawa  
Chris Warkentin  
Jeff Watson  
David Wilks  
John Williamson  
Stephen Woodworth  
Terence Young  
Wai Young  
Bob Zimmer

---

## FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

<b>Chair:</b>	Dean Allison	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	Paul Dewar Marc Garneau	
Mike Allen David Anderson Lois Brown	Peter Goldring Nina Grewal	Hélène Laverdière Laurin Liu	Romeo Saganash Gary Schellenberger	(12)

### Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy Eve Adams Mark Adler Dan Albas Harold Albrecht Stella Ambler Rob Anders Scott Armstrong Keith Ashfield Jay Aspin Joyce Bateman Leon Benoit James Bezan Kelly Block Ray Boughen Peter Braid Garry Breitkreuz Gordon Brown Patrick Brown Rod Bruinooge Brad Butt Paul Calandra Blaine Calkins Ron Cannan John Carmichael Colin Carrie Corneliu Chisu Michael Chong Rob Clarke Irwin Cotler	Joan Crockatt Joe Daniel Patricia Davidson Don Davies Bob Dechert Earl Dreeshen Rick Dykstra Steven Fletcher Royal Galipeau Cheryl Gallant Parm Gill Robert Goguen Jacques Gourde Richard Harris Laurie Hawn Bryan Hayes Russ Hiebert Jim Hillyer Randy Hoback Ed Holder Pierre Jacob Roxanne James Brian Jean Peter Julian Randy Kamp Gerald Keddy Peter Kent Greg Kerr Ed Komarnicki Daryl Kramp	Mike Lake Guy Lauzon Ryan Leef Pierre Lemieux Chungsen Leung Wladyslaw Lizon Ben Lobb Tom Lukiwski James Lunney Dave MacKenzie Wayne Marston Colin Mayes Phil McColeman Cathy McLeod Costas Menegakis Ted Menzies Rob Merrifield Larry Miller Marc-André Morin Rick Norlock Deepak Obhrai Gordon O'Connor Tilly O'Neill Gordon Ted Opitz Erin O'Toole LaVar Payne Ève Pécelet Joe Preston James Rajotte Scott Reid	Blake Richards Andrew Saxton Kyle Seeback Bev Shipley Devinder Shory Joy Smith Robert Sopuck Brian Storseth Mark Strahl David Sweet David Tilsen Lawrence Toet Brad Trost Bernard Trotter Susan Truppe Dave Van Kesteren Maurice Vellacott Mike Wallace Mark Warawa Chris Warkentin Jeff Watson John Weston Rodney Weston David Wilks John Williamson Stephen Woodworth Terence Young Wai Young Bob Zimmer
--	---	---	--

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS

<b>Chair:</b>	Scott Reid	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	Irwin Cotler Wayne Marston	
Nina Grewal	Pierre Jacob	Gary Schellenberger	David Sweet	(7)

## GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS AND ESTIMATES

**Chair:**

Pierre-Luc Dusseault

**Vice-Chairs:**Gerry Byrne  
Gordon O'ConnorDiane Ablonczy  
Jay Aspin  
Denis BlanchetteRon Cannan  
Anne-Marie DayEd Komarnicki  
Pat MartinBernard Trottier  
Dave Van Kesteren

(12)

### Associate Members

Eve Adams  
Mark Adler  
Dan Albas  
Harold Albrecht  
Mike Allen  
Dean Allison  
Stella Ambler  
Rob Anders  
David Anderson  
Scott Armstrong  
Keith Ashfield  
Joyce Bateman  
Leon Benoit  
James Bezan  
Kelly Block  
Françoise Boivin  
Ray Boughen  
Peter Braid  
Garry Breitzkreuz  
Gordon Brown  
Lois Brown  
Patrick Brown  
Rod Bruinooge  
Brad Butt  
Paul Calandra  
Blaine Calkins  
John Carmichael  
Colin Carrie  
Corneliu Chisu  
Michael Chong

Rob Clarke  
Joan Crockatt  
Joe Daniel  
Patricia Davidson  
Bob Dechert  
Paul Dewar  
Earl Dreeshen  
Linda Duncan  
Rick Dykstra  
Steven Fletcher  
Royal Galipeau  
Cheryl Gallant  
Parm Gill  
Robert Goguen  
Peter Goldring  
Jacques Gourde  
Nina Grewal  
Richard Harris  
Laurie Hawn  
Bryan Hayes  
Russ Hiebert  
Jim Hillyer  
Randy Hoback  
Ed Holder  
Roxanne James  
Brian Jean  
Peter Julian  
Randy Kamp  
Gerald Keddy  
Peter Kent

Greg Kerr  
Daryl Kramp  
Mike Lake  
Guy Lauzon  
Ryan Leef  
Pierre Lemieux  
Chungsen Leung  
Wladyslaw Lizon  
Ben Lobb  
Tom Lukiwski  
James Lunney  
Dave MacKenzie  
Colin Mayes  
Phil McColeman  
Cathy McLeod  
Costas Menegakis  
Ted Menzies  
Rob Merrifield  
Larry Miller  
Rick Norlock  
Deepak Obhrai  
Tilly O'Neill Gordon  
Ted Opitz  
Erin O'Toole  
LaVar Payne  
Joe Preston  
James Rajotte  
Mathieu Ravignat  
Scott Reid

Blake Richards  
Andrew Saxton  
Gary Schellenberger  
Kyle Seeback  
Bev Shipley  
Devinder Shory  
Joy Smith  
Robert Sopuck  
Brian Storseth  
Mark Strahl  
David Sweet  
David Tilson  
Lawrence Toet  
Brad Trost  
Susan Truppe  
Nycole Turmel  
Maurice Vellacott  
Mike Wallace  
Mark Warawa  
Chris Warkentin  
Jeff Watson  
John Weston  
Rodney Weston  
David Wilks  
John Williamson  
Stephen Woodworth  
Terence Young  
Wai Young  
Bob Zimmer

---



**HEALTH****Chair:**

Ben Lobb

**Vice-Chairs:**Libby Davies  
Hedy FryEve Adams  
Earl Dreeshen  
Laurie HawnWladyslaw Lizon  
Wayne MarstonDany Morin  
Isabelle MorinJoy Smith  
David Wilks

(12)

**Associate Members**Diane Ablonczy  
Mark Adler  
Dan Albas  
Harold Albrecht  
Mike Allen  
Dean Allison  
Stella Ambler  
Rob Anders  
David Anderson  
Scott Armstrong  
Keith Ashfield  
Jay Aspin  
Joyce Bateman  
Leon Benoit  
James Bezan  
Kelly Block  
Ray Boughen  
Peter Braid  
Garry Breitzkreuz  
Gordon Brown  
Lois Brown  
Patrick Brown  
Rod Bruinooge  
Brad Butt  
Paul Calandra  
Blaine Calkins  
Ron Cannan  
John Carmichael  
Colin Carrie  
Corneliu Chisu  
Michael ChongRob Clarke  
Joan Crockatt  
Joe Daniel  
Patricia Davidson  
Bob Dechert  
Rick Dykstra  
Steven Fletcher  
Royal Galipeau  
Cheryl Gallant  
Parm Gill  
Robert Goguen  
Peter Goldring  
Jacques Gourde  
Nina Grewal  
Richard Harris  
Bryan Hayes  
Russ Hiebert  
Jim Hillyer  
Randy Hoback  
Ed Holder  
Carol Hughes  
Roxanne James  
Brian Jean  
Peter Julian  
Randy Kamp  
Gerald Keddy  
Peter Kent  
Greg Kerr  
Ed Komarnicki  
Daryl KrampMike Lake  
Guy Lauzon  
Ryan Leef  
Pierre Lemieux  
Megan Leslie  
Chungsen Leung  
Tom Lukiwski  
James Lunney  
Dave MacKenzie  
Colin Mayes  
Phil McColeman  
Cathy McLeod  
Costas Menegakis  
Ted Menzies  
Rob Merrifield  
Larry Miller  
Christine Moore  
Rick Norlock  
Deepak Obhrai  
Gordon O'Connor  
Tilly O'Neill Gordon  
Ted Opitz  
Erin O'Toole  
LaVar Payne  
Manon Perreault  
Joe Preston  
James Rajotte  
Scott Reid  
Blake Richards  
Andrew SaxtonGary Schellenberger  
Kyle Seeback  
Djaouida Sellah  
Bev Shipley  
Devinder Shory  
Jinny Jogindera Sims  
Robert Sopuck  
Brian Storseth  
Mark Strahl  
Mike Sullivan  
David Sweet  
Glenn Thibeault  
David Tilson  
Lawrence Toet  
Brad Trost  
Bernard Trottier  
Susan Truppe  
Dave Van Kesteren  
Maurice Vellacott  
Mike Wallace  
Mark Warawa  
Chris Warkentin  
Jeff Watson  
John Weston  
Rodney Weston  
John Williamson  
Stephen Woodworth  
Terence Young  
Wai Young  
Bob Zimmer

**HUMAN RESOURCES, SKILLS AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT AND THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH  
DISABILITIES**

**Chair:** Phil McColeman

**Vice-Chairs:**

Rodger Cuzner  
Jinny Jogindera Sims

Scott Armstrong  
Alexandre Boulterice  
Brad Butt

Joe Daniel  
Sadia Groguhé

Colin Mayes  
Cathy McLeod

Devinder Shory  
Jonathan Tremblay

(12)

**Associate Members**

Diane Ablonczy  
Eve Adams  
Mark Adler  
Dan Albas  
Harold Albrecht  
Mike Allen  
Dean Allison  
Stella Ambler  
Rob Anders  
David Anderson  
Keith Ashfield  
Jay Aspin  
Joyce Bateman  
Leon Benoit  
James Bezan  
Lysane Blanchette-Lamothe  
Kelly Block  
Ray Boughen  
Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet  
Peter Braid  
Garry Breitreuz  
Gordon Brown  
Lois Brown  
Patrick Brown  
Rod Bruinooge  
Paul Calandra  
Blaine Calkins  
Ron Cannan  
John Carmichael  
Colin Carrie  
Chris Charlton  
Corneliu Chisu

Michael Chong  
Rob Clarke  
Joan Crockatt  
Patricia Davidson  
Bob Dechert  
Earl Dreeshen  
Matthew Dubé  
Rick Dykstra  
Steven Fletcher  
Mylène Freeman  
Royal Galipeau  
Cheryl Gallant  
Alain Giguère  
Parm Gill  
Yvon Godin  
Robert Goguen  
Peter Goldring  
Jacques Gourde  
Nina Grewal  
Dan Harris  
Richard Harris  
Laurie Hawn  
Bryan Hayes  
Russ Hiebert  
Jim Hillyer  
Randy Hoback  
Ed Holder  
Roxanne James  
Brian Jean  
Peter Julian  
Randy Kamp

Gerald Keddy  
Peter Kent  
Greg Kerr  
Ed Komarnicki  
Daryl Kramp  
Mike Lake  
Guy Lauzon  
Ryan Leef  
Pierre Lemieux  
Chungsen Leung  
Wladyslaw Lizon  
Ben Lobb  
Tom Lukiwski  
James Lunney  
Dave MacKenzie  
Irene Mathysen  
Costas Menegakis  
Ted Menzies  
Rob Merrifield  
Larry Miller  
Rick Norlock  
Deepak Obhrai  
Gordon O'Connor  
Tilly O'Neill Gordon  
Ted Opitz  
Erin O'Toole  
LaVar Payne  
Manon Perreault  
Joe Preston  
James Rajotte  
Scott Reid

Blake Richards  
Andrew Saxton  
Gary Schellenberger  
Kyle Seeback  
Bev Shipley  
Rathika Sitsabaiesan  
Joy Smith  
Robert Sopuck  
Brian Storseth  
Mark Strahl  
Mike Sullivan  
David Sweet  
David Tilson  
Lawrence Toet  
Brad Trost  
Bernard Trotter  
Susan Truppe  
Dave Van Kesteren  
Maurice Vellacott  
Mike Wallace  
Mark Warawa  
Chris Warkentin  
Jeff Watson  
John Weston  
Rodney Weston  
David Wilks  
John Williamson  
Stephen Woodworth  
Terence Young  
Wai Young  
Bob Zimmer

## INDUSTRY, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

**Chair:** David Sweet

**Vice-Chairs:** Chris Charlton  
Judy Sgro

Cheryl Gallant  
Ed Holder  
Brian Jean

Mike Lake  
Phil McColeman

Anne Minh-Thu Quach  
Kennedy Stewart

Glenn Thibeault  
Mark Warawa

(12)

### Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy  
Eve Adams  
Mark Adler  
Dan Albas  
Harold Albrecht  
Malcolm Allen  
Mike Allen  
Dean Allison  
Stella Ambler  
Rob Anders  
David Anderson  
Charlie Angus  
Scott Armstrong  
Keith Ashfield  
Jay Aspin  
Joyce Bateman  
Mauril Bélanger  
Leon Benoit  
Tyrone Benskin  
James Bezan  
Kelly Block  
Charmaine Borg  
Ray Boughen  
Peter Braid  
Garry Breitzkreuz  
Gordon Brown  
Lois Brown  
Patrick Brown  
Rod Bruinooge  
Brad Butt  
Paul Calandra

Blaine Calkins  
Ron Cannan  
John Carmichael  
Colin Carrie  
Corneliu Chisu  
Michael Chong  
Rob Clarke  
Joan Crockett  
Joe Daniel  
Patricia Davidson  
Bob Dechert  
Earl Dreeshen  
Rick Dykstra  
Steven Fletcher  
Royal Galipeau  
Parm Gill  
Robert Goguen  
Peter Goldring  
Jacques Gourde  
Nina Grewal  
Dan Harris  
Richard Harris  
Laurie Hawn  
Bryan Hayes  
Russ Hiebert  
Jim Hillyer  
Randy Hoback  
Roxanne James  
Peter Julian  
Randy Kamp

Gerald Keddy  
Peter Kent  
Greg Kerr  
Ed Komarnicki  
Daryl Kramp  
Guy Lauzon  
Hélène LeBlanc  
Ryan Leef  
Pierre Lemieux  
Chungsen Leung  
Wladyslaw Lizon  
Ben Lobb  
Tom Lukiwski  
James Lunney  
Dave MacKenzie  
Brian Masse  
Colin Mayes  
Cathy McLeod  
Costas Menegakis  
Ted Menzies  
Rob Merrifield  
Larry Miller  
Rick Norlock  
Deepak Obhrai  
Gordon O'Connor  
Tilly O'Neill Gordon  
Ted Opitz  
Erin O'Toole  
LaVar Payne  
Joe Preston

James Rajotte  
Scott Reid  
Blake Richards  
Andrew Saxton  
Gary Schellenberger  
Kyle Seeback  
Bev Shipley  
Devinder Shory  
Joy Smith  
Robert Sopuck  
Brian Storseth  
Mark Strahl  
David Tilson  
Lawrence Toet  
Brad Trost  
Bernard Trotter  
Susan Truppe  
Dave Van Kesteren  
Maurice Vellacott  
Mike Wallace  
Chris Warkentin  
Jeff Watson  
John Weston  
Rodney Weston  
David Wilks  
John Williamson  
Stephen Woodworth  
Terence Young  
Wai Young  
Bob Zimmer

**INTERNATIONAL TRADE****Chair:** Rob Merrifield**Vice-Chairs:** Don Davies

Massimo Pacetti

Ron Cannan  
Russ Hiebert  
Ed HolderBrian Masse  
Ted MenziesMarc-André Morin  
Erin O'TooleJasbir Sandhu  
Devinder Shory

(12)

**Associate Members**Diane Ablonczy  
Eve Adams  
Mark Adler  
Dan Albas  
Harold Albrecht  
Mike Allen  
Dean Allison  
Stella Ambler  
Rob Anders  
David Anderson  
Scott Armstrong  
Keith Ashfield  
Jay Aspin  
Joyce Bateman  
Leon Benoit  
James Bezan  
Kelly Block  
Ray Boughen  
Peter Braid  
Garry Breitzkreuz  
Gordon Brown  
Lois Brown  
Patrick Brown  
Rod Bruinooge  
Brad Butt  
Paul Calandra  
Blaine Calkins  
John Carmichael  
Colin Carrie  
Corneliu ChisuMichael Chong  
Rob Clarke  
Joan Crockett  
Joe Daniel  
Patricia Davidson  
Bob Dechert  
Paul Dewar  
Earl Dreesen  
Rick Dykstra  
Steven Fletcher  
Royal Galipeau  
Cheryl Gallant  
Marc Gameau  
Parm Gill  
Robert Goguen  
Peter Goldring  
Jacques Gourde  
Nina Grewal  
Richard Harris  
Laurie Hawn  
Bryan Hayes  
Jim Hillyer  
Randy Hoback  
Roxanne James  
Brian Jean  
Peter Julian  
Randy Kamp  
Gerald Keddy  
Peter Kent  
Greg KerrEd Komarnicki  
Daryl Kramp  
Mike Lake  
Guy Lauzon  
Hélène Laverdière  
Ryan Leef  
Pierre Lemieux  
Chungsen Leung  
Wladyslaw Lizon  
Ben Lobb  
Tom Lukiwski  
James Lunney  
Dave MacKenzie  
Colin Mayes  
Phil McColeman  
Cathy McLeod  
Costas Menegakis  
Larry Miller  
Rick Norlock  
Deepak Obhrai  
Gordon O'Connor  
Tilly O'Neill Gordon  
Ted Opitz  
LaVar Payne  
Joe Preston  
James Rajotte  
Mathieu Ravignat  
Scott Reid  
Blake RichardsAndrew Saxton  
Gary Schellenberger  
Kyle Seeback  
Bev Shipley  
Jinny Jogindera Sims  
Joy Smith  
Robert Sopuck  
Brian Storseth  
Mark Strahl  
David Sweet  
David Tilson  
Lawrence Toet  
Brad Trost  
Bernard Trotter  
Susan Truppe  
Dave Van Kesteren  
Maurice Vellacott  
Mike Wallace  
Mark Warawa  
Chris Warkentin  
Jeff Watson  
John Weston  
Rodney Weston  
David Wilks  
John Williamson  
Stephen Woodworth  
Terence Young  
Wai Young  
Bob Zimmer

## JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

**Chair:** Mike Wallace

**Vice-Chairs:**

Françoise Boivin  
Sean Casey

Patrick Brown  
Blaine Calkins  
Bob Dechert

Robert Goguen  
Pierre Jacob

Matthew Kellway  
Ève Pécelet

Kyle Seeback  
David Wilks

(12)

### Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy  
Eve Adams  
Mark Adler  
Dan Albas  
Harold Albrecht  
Mike Allen  
Dean Allison  
Stella Ambler  
Rob Anders  
David Anderson  
Scott Armstrong  
Keith Ashfield  
Jay Aspin  
Joyce Bateman  
Leon Benoit  
James Bezan  
Kelly Block  
Ray Boughen  
Peter Braid  
Garry Breitzkreuz  
Gordon Brown  
Lois Brown  
Rod Bruinooge  
Brad Butt  
Paul Calandra  
Ron Cannan  
John Carmichael  
Colin Carrie  
Corneliu Chisu  
Michael Chong

Rob Clarke  
Joan Crockatt  
Joe Daniel  
Patricia Davidson  
Earl Dreeshen  
Rick Dykstra  
Steven Fletcher  
Royal Galipeau  
Cheryl Gallant  
Randall Garrison  
Parm Gill  
Peter Goldring  
Jacques Gourde  
Nina Grewal  
Jack Harris  
Richard Harris  
Laurie Hawn  
Bryan Hayes  
Russ Hiebert  
Jim Hillyer  
Randy Hoback  
Ed Holder  
Roxanne James  
Brian Jean  
Peter Julian  
Randy Kamp  
Gerald Keddy  
Peter Kent  
Greg Kerr  
Ed Komarnicki

Daryl Kramp  
Mike Lake  
Guy Lauzon  
Ryan Leef  
Pierre Lemieux  
Chungsen Leung  
Wladyslaw Lizon  
Ben Lobb  
Tom Lukiwski  
James Lunney  
Dave MacKenzie  
Wayne Marston  
Colin Mayes  
Phil McColeman  
Cathy McLeod  
Costas Menegakis  
Ted Menzies  
Rob Merrifield  
Larry Miller  
Rick Norlock  
Deepak Obhrai  
Gordon O'Connor  
Tilly O'Neill Gordon  
Ted Opitz  
Erin O'Toole  
LaVar Payne  
Joe Preston  
James Rajotte  
Murray Rankin

Scott Reid  
Blake Richards  
Andrew Saxton  
Gary Schellenberger  
Bev Shipley  
Devinder Shory  
Jinny Jogindera Sims  
Joy Smith  
Robert Sopuck  
Brian Storseth  
Mark Strahl  
David Sweet  
David Tilson  
Lawrence Toet  
Brad Trost  
Bernard Trotter  
Susan Truppe  
Dave Van Kesteren  
Maurice Vellacott  
Mark Warawa  
Chris Warkentin  
Jeff Watson  
John Weston  
Rodney Weston  
John Williamson  
Stephen Woodworth  
Terence Young  
Wai Young  
Bob Zimmer

**LIAISON**

<b>Chair:</b>	Dean Allison	<b>Vice-Chair:</b>	David Christopherson	
Harold Albrecht	Royal Galipeau	Phil McColeman	Joy Smith	(26)
Leon Benoit	Peter Kent	Rob Merrifield	David Sweet	
Gordon Brown	Greg Kerr	Larry Miller	David Tilson	
Chris Charlton	Daryl Kramp	Joe Preston	Mike Wallace	
Michael Chong	Hélène LeBlanc	James Rajotte	Chris Warkentin	
Pierre-Luc Dusseault	Pat Martin	Bev Shipley	Rodney Weston	

**Associate Members**

Malcolm Allen	Jean Crowder	Yvon Godin	Joyce Murray
Scott Andrews	Rodger Cuzner	Jack Harris	Pierre Nantel
Mauril Bélanger	Patricia Davidson	Carol Hughes	Peggy Nash
Carolyn Bennett	Don Davies	Peter Julian	Gordon O'Connor
Lysane Blanchette-Lamothe	Libby Davies	Jim Karygiannis	Tilly O'Neill Gordon
Françoise Boivin	Paul Dewar	Kevin Lamoureux	Massimo Pacetti
Garry Breitkreuz	Stéphane Dion	Alexandrine Latendresse	Geoff Regan
Scott Brison	Kirsty Duncan	Megan Leslie	Judy Sgro
Gerry Byrne	Wayne Easter	Lawrence MacAulay	Scott Simms
John Carmichael	Mark Eyking	John McCallum	Jinny Jogindera Sims
Sean Casey	Hedy Fry	David McGuinty	Lise St-Denis
Robert Chisholm	Marc Garneau	John McKay	Peter Stoffer
Olivia Chow	Randall Garrison		

**SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMITTEE BUDGETS**

<b>Chair:</b>	Dean Allison	<b>Vice-Chair:</b>		
David Christopherson	Phil McColeman	Joe Preston	Chris Warkentin	(7)
Pat Martin	Larry Miller			

## NATIONAL DEFENCE

**Chair:**

Peter Kent

**Vice-Chairs:**
Jack Harris  
Joyce MurrayJames Bezan  
Tarik Brahmi  
Cheryl GallantJean-François Larose  
Élaine MichaudRick Norlock  
Ted OpitzBrian Storseth  
John Williamson

(12)

### Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy  
Eve Adams  
Mark Adler  
Dan Albas  
Harold Albrecht  
Mike Allen  
Dean Allison  
Stella Ambler  
Rob Anders  
David Anderson  
Scott Armstrong  
Keith Ashfield  
Jay Aspin  
Joyce Bateman  
Leon Benoit  
Kelly Block  
Ray Boughen  
Peter Braid  
Garry Breitzkreuz  
Gordon Brown  
Lois Brown  
Patrick Brown  
Rod Bruinooge  
Brad Butt  
Paul Calandra  
Blaine Calkins  
Ron Cannan  
John Carmichael  
Colin Carrie  
Corneliu ChisuMichael Chong  
Rob Clarke  
Joan Crockatt  
Joe Daniel  
Patricia Davidson  
Bob Dechert  
Earl Dreesen  
Rick Dykstra  
Steven Fletcher  
Royal Galipeau  
Randall Garrison  
Parm Gill  
Robert Goguen  
Peter Goldring  
Jacques Gourde  
Nina Grewal  
Richard Harris  
Laurie Hawn  
Bryan Hayes  
Russ Hiebert  
Jim Hillyer  
Randy Hoback  
Ed Holder  
Roxanne James  
Brian Jean  
Peter Julian  
Randy Kamp  
Gerald Keddy  
Greg KerrEd Komarnicki  
Daryl Kramp  
Mike Lake  
Guy Lauzon  
Ryan Leef  
Pierre Lemieux  
Megan Leslie  
Chungsen Leung  
Wladyslaw Lizon  
Ben Lobb  
Tom Lukiwski  
James Lunney  
Dave MacKenzie  
Colin Mayes  
Phil McColeman  
Cathy McLeod  
Costas Menegakis  
Ted Menzies  
Rob Merrifield  
Larry Miller  
Christine Moore  
Deepak Obhrai  
Gordon O'Connor  
Tilly O'Neill Gordon  
Erin O'Toole  
LaVar Payne  
Joe Preston  
James Rajotte  
Scott ReidBlake Richards  
Andrew Saxton  
Gary Schellenberger  
Kyle Seeback  
Bev Shipley  
Devinder Shory  
Joy Smith  
Robert Sopuck  
Peter Stoffer  
Mark Strahl  
David Sweet  
David Tilson  
Lawrence Toet  
Brad Trost  
Bernard Trotter  
Susan Truppe  
Dave Van Kesteren  
Maurice Vellacott  
Mike Wallace  
Mark Warawa  
Chris Warkentin  
Jeff Watson  
John Weston  
Rodney Weston  
David Wilks  
Stephen Woodworth  
Terence Young  
Wai Young  
Bob Zimmer

## NATURAL RESOURCES

**Chair:** Leon Benoit

**Vice-Chairs:** Peter Julian  
Geoff Regan

Mike Allen  
Kelly Block  
Joan Crockatt

Linda Duncan  
Claude Gravelle

Ryan Leef  
Christine Moore

Brad Trost  
Bob Zimmer

(12)

### Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy  
Eve Adams  
Mark Adler  
Dan Albas  
Harold Albrecht  
Dean Allison  
Stella Ambler  
Rob Anders  
David Anderson  
Charlie Angus  
Scott Armstrong  
Keith Ashfield  
Jay Aspin  
Joyce Bateman  
James Bezan  
Ray Boughen  
Peter Braid  
Garry Breitzkreuz  
Gordon Brown  
Lois Brown  
Patrick Brown  
Rod Bruinooge  
Brad Butt  
Paul Calandra  
Blaine Calkins  
Ron Cannan  
John Carmichael  
Colin Carrie  
Corneliu Chisu  
Michael Chong

Rob Clarke  
Nathan Cullen  
Joe Daniel  
Patricia Davidson  
Bob Dechert  
Earl Dreeshen  
Rick Dykstra  
Steven Fletcher  
Royal Galipeau  
Cheryl Gallant  
Parm Gill  
Yvon Godin  
Robert Goguen  
Peter Goldring  
Jacques Gourde  
Nina Grewal  
Richard Harris  
Laurie Hawn  
Bryan Hayes  
Russ Hiebert  
Jim Hillyer  
Randy Hoback  
Ed Holder  
Carol Hughes  
Roxanne James  
Brian Jean  
Randy Kamp  
Gerald Keddy  
Peter Kent  
Greg Kerr

Ed Komarnicki  
Daryl Kramp  
Mike Lake  
Guy Lauzon  
Pierre Lemieux  
Chungsen Leung  
Wladyslaw Lizon  
Ben Lobb  
Tom Lukiwski  
James Lunney  
Dave MacKenzie  
Colin Mayes  
Phil McColeman  
Cathy McLeod  
Costas Menegakis  
Ted Menzies  
Rob Merrifield  
Larry Miller  
Rick Norlock  
Deepak Obhrai  
Gordon O'Connor  
Tilly O'Neill Gordon  
Ted Opitz  
Erin O'Toole  
LaVar Payne  
Joe Preston  
John Rafferty  
James Rajotte  
Scott Reid  
Blake Richards

Romeo Saganash  
Andrew Saxton  
Gary Schellenberger  
Kyle Seeback  
Bev Shipley  
Devinder Shory  
Joy Smith  
Robert Sopuck  
Kennedy Stewart  
Brian Storseth  
Mark Strahl  
David Sweet  
Glenn Thibeault  
David Tilson  
Lawrence Toet  
Bernard Trottier  
Susan Truppe  
Dave Van Kesteren  
Maurice Vellacott  
Mike Wallace  
Mark Warawa  
Chris Warkentin  
Jeff Watson  
John Weston  
Rodney Weston  
David Wilks  
John Williamson  
Stephen Woodworth  
Terence Young  
Wai Young

---



**OFFICIAL LANGUAGES**

<b>Chair:</b>	Michael Chong	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	Yvon Godin Lise St-Denis	
Joyce Bateman Tyrone Benskin Corneliu Chisu	Joe Daniel Pierre Dionne Labelle	Royal Galipeau Jacques Gourde	Jamie Nicholls John Williamson	(12)

**Associate Members**

Diane Ablonczy	Rob Clarke	Mike Lake	Andrew Saxton
Eve Adams	Joan Crockatt	Alexandrine Latendresse	Gary Schellenberger
Mark Adler	Patricia Davidson	Guy Lauzon	Kyle Seeback
Dan Albas	Bob Dechert	Ryan Leef	Bev Shipley
Harold Albrecht	Stéphane Dion	Pierre Lemieux	Devinder Shory
Mike Allen	Earl Dreeshen	Chungsen Leung	Joy Smith
Dean Allison	Rick Dykstra	Wladyslaw Lizon	Robert Sopuck
Stella Ambler	Steven Fletcher	Ben Lobb	Brian Storseth
Rob Anders	Cheryl Gallant	Tom Lukiwski	Mark Strahl
David Anderson	Parm Gill	James Lunney	David Sweet
Scott Armstrong	Robert Goguen	Dave MacKenzie	David Tilson
Keith Ashfield	Peter Goldring	Colin Mayes	Lawrence Toet
Jay Aspin	Nina Grewal	Phil McColeman	Brad Trost
Robert Aubin	Dan Harris	Cathy McLeod	Bernard Trotter
Leon Benoit	Richard Harris	Costas Menegakis	Susan Truppe
James Bezan	Laurie Hawn	Ted Menzies	Nycole Turmel
Kelly Block	Bryan Hayes	Rob Merrifield	Dave Van Kesteren
Ray Boughen	Russ Hiebert	Larry Miller	Maurice Vellacott
Peter Braid	Jim Hillyer	Rick Norlock	Mike Wallace
Garry Breitzkreuz	Randy Hoback	Deepak Obhrai	Mark Warawa
Gordon Brown	Ed Holder	Gordon O'Connor	Chris Warkentin
Lois Brown	Roxanne James	Tilly O'Neill Gordon	Jeff Watson
Patrick Brown	Brian Jean	Ted Opitz	John Weston
Rod Bruinooge	Peter Julian	Erin O'Toole	Rodney Weston
Brad Butt	Randy Kamp	LaVar Payne	David Wilks
Paul Calandra	Gerald Keddy	Joe Preston	Stephen Woodworth
Blaine Calkins	Peter Kent	James Rajotte	Terence Young
Ron Cannan	Greg Kerr	Scott Reid	Wai Young
John Carmichael	Ed Komarnicki	Blake Richards	Bob Zimmer
Colin Carrie	Daryl Kramp		

---

## PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

<b>Chair:</b>	Joe Preston	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	Kevin Lamoureux Alexandrine Latendresse	
Brad Butt Nathan Cullen Tom Lukiwski	Dave MacKenzie Ted Opitz	Scott Reid Blake Richards	Craig Scott Nycole Turmel	(12)

### Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy	Corneliu Chisu	Randy Kamp	Kyle Seeback
Eve Adams	Michael Chong	Gerald Keddy	Bev Shipley
Mark Adler	David Christopherson	Peter Kent	Devinder Shory
Dan Albas	Rob Clarke	Greg Kerr	Joy Smith
Harold Albrecht	Joan Crockatt	Ed Komarnicki	Robert Sopuck
Mike Allen	Joe Daniel	Daryl Kramp	Brian Storseth
Dean Allison	Patricia Davidson	Mike Lake	Mark Strahl
Stella Ambler	Bob Dechert	Guy Lauzon	David Sweet
Rob Anders	Earl Dreeshen	Ryan Leef	David Tilson
David Anderson	Rick Dykstra	Pierre Lemieux	Lawrence Toet
Scott Armstrong	Steven Fletcher	Chungsen Leung	Philip Toone
Keith Ashfield	Royal Galipeau	Wladyslaw Lizon	Brad Trost
Jay Aspin	Cheryl Gallant	Ben Lobb	Bernard Trottier
Joyce Bateman	Parm Gill	James Lunney	Susan Truppe
Leon Benoit	Yvon Godin	Colin Mayes	Frank Valeriotte
James Bezan	Robert Goguen	Phil McColeman	Dave Van Kesteren
Kelly Block	Peter Goldring	Cathy McLeod	Maurice Vellacott
Ray Boughen	Jacques Gourde	Costas Menegakis	Mike Wallace
Peter Braid	Nina Grewal	Ted Menzies	Mark Warawa
Garry Breitzkreuz	Sadia Grogue	Rob Merrifield	Chris Warkentin
Gordon Brown	Richard Harris	Larry Miller	Jeff Watson
Lois Brown	Laurie Hawn	Rick Norlock	John Weston
Patrick Brown	Bryan Hayes	Deepak Obhrai	Rodney Weston
Rod Bruinooge	Russ Hiebert	Gordon O'Connor	David Wilks
Paul Calandra	Jim Hillyer	Tilly O'Neill Gordon	John Williamson
Blaine Calkins	Randy Hoback	Erin O'Toole	Stephen Woodworth
Ron Cannan	Ed Holder	LaVar Payne	Terence Young
John Carmichael	Roxanne James	James Rajotte	Wai Young
Colin Carrie	Brian Jean	Andrew Saxton	Bob Zimmer
Chris Charlton	Peter Julian	Gary Schellenberger	

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

<b>Chair:</b>	Dave MacKenzie	<b>Vice-Chair:</b>		
Brad Butt	Philip Toone	Frank Valeriotte		(4)

**PUBLIC ACCOUNTS****Chair:**

David Christopherson

**Vice-Chairs:**John Carmichael  
Scott SimmsMark Adler  
Dan Albas  
Malcolm AllenJay Aspin  
Alain GiguèreDan Harris  
Bryan HayesBev Shipley  
Stephen Woodworth

(12)

**Associate Members**Diane Ablonczy  
Eve Adams  
Harold Albrecht  
Mike Allen  
Dean Allison  
Stella Ambler  
Rob Anders  
David Anderson  
Scott Armstrong  
Keith Ashfield  
Joyce Bateman  
Leon Benoit  
James Bezan  
Lysane Blanchette-Lamothe  
Kelly Block  
Ray Boughen  
Peter Braid  
Garry Breitzkreuz  
Gordon Brown  
Lois Brown  
Patrick Brown  
Rod Bruinooge  
Brad Butt  
Paul Calandra  
Blaine Calkins  
Ron Cannan  
Colin Carrie  
Corneliu Chisu  
Michael ChongRob Clarke  
Joan Crockatt  
Joe Daniel  
Patricia Davidson  
Bob Dechert  
Earl Dreeshen  
Pierre-Luc Dusseault  
Rick Dykstra  
Steven Fletcher  
Royal Galipeau  
Cheryl Gallant  
Parm Gill  
Robert Goguen  
Peter Goldring  
Jacques Gourde  
Nina Grewal  
Richard Harris  
Laurie Hawn  
Russ Hiebert  
Jim Hillyer  
Randy Hoback  
Ed Holder  
Roxanne James  
Brian Jean  
Peter Julian  
Randy Kamp  
Gerald Keddy  
Peter Kent  
Greg KerrEd Komarnicki  
Daryl Kramp  
Mike Lake  
Guy Lauzon  
Ryan Leef  
Pierre Lemieux  
Chungsen Leung  
Wladyslaw Lizon  
Ben Lobb  
Tom Lukiwski  
James Lunney  
Dave MacKenzie  
Colin Mayes  
Phil McColeman  
Cathy McLeod  
Costas Menegakis  
Richard Menzies  
Rob Merrifield  
Larry Miller  
Rick Norlock  
Deepak Obhrai  
Gordon O'Connor  
Tilly O'Neill Gordon  
Ted Opitz  
Erin O'Toole  
LaVar Payne  
Joe Preston  
James Rajotte  
Scott ReidBlake Richards  
Andrew Saxton  
Gary Schellenberger  
Kyle Seeback  
Devinder Shory  
Joy Smith  
Robert Sopuck  
Brian Storseth  
Mark Strahl  
David Sweet  
Glenn Thibeault  
David Tilson  
Lawrence Toet  
Brad Trost  
Bernard Trottier  
Susan Truppe  
Dave Van Kesteren  
Maurice Vellacott  
Mike Wallace  
Mark Warawa  
Chris Warkentin  
Jeff Watson  
John Weston  
Rodney Weston  
David Wilks  
John Williamson  
Terence Young  
Wai Young  
Bob Zimmer

**PUBLIC SAFETY AND NATIONAL SECURITY**

**Chair:**

Daryl Kramp

**Vice-Chairs:**Wayne Easter  
Randall GarrisonMichael Chong  
Rosane Doré Lefebvre  
Roxanne JamesTed Menzies  
Rick NorlockLaVar Payne  
François PilonJean Rousseau  
Rodney Weston

(12)

**Associate Members**

Diane Ablonczy  
Eve Adams  
Mark Adler  
Dan Albas  
Harold Albrecht  
Mike Allen  
Dean Allison  
Stella Ambler  
Rob Anders  
David Anderson  
Scott Armstrong  
Keith Ashfield  
Jay Aspin  
Joyce Bateman  
Leon Benoit  
James Bezan  
Kelly Block  
Charmaine Borg  
Ray Boughen  
Peter Braid  
Garry Breitzkreuz  
Gordon Brown  
Lois Brown  
Patrick Brown  
Rod Bruinooge  
Brad Butt  
Paul Calandra  
Blaine Calkins  
Ron Cannan  
John CarmichaelColin Carrie  
Corneliu Chisu  
Rob Clarke  
Joan Crockatt  
Joe Daniel  
Patricia Davidson  
Don Davies  
Bob Dechert  
Earl Dreesen  
Rick Dykstra  
Steven Fletcher  
Royal Galipeau  
Cheryl Gallant  
Parm Gill  
Robert Goguen  
Peter Goldring  
Jacques Gourde  
Nina Grewal  
Jack Harris  
Richard Harris  
Laurie Hawn  
Bryan Hayes  
Russ Hiebert  
Jim Hillyer  
Randy Hoback  
Ed Holder  
Brian Jean  
Peter Julian  
Randy Kamp  
Gerald KeddyPeter Kent  
Greg Kerr  
Ed Komarnicki  
Mike Lake  
Guy Lauzon  
Ryan Leef  
Pierre Lemieux  
Chungsen Leung  
Wladyslaw Lizon  
Ben Lobb  
Tom Lukiwski  
James Lunney  
Dave MacKenzie  
Colin Mayes  
Phil McColeman  
Cathy McLeod  
Costas Menegakis  
Rob Merrifield  
Larry Miller  
Deepak Obhrai  
Gordon O'Connor  
Tilly O'Neill Gordon  
Ted Opitz  
Erin O'Toole  
Joe Preston  
John Rafferty  
James Rajotte  
Murray Rankin  
Scott ReidBlake Richards  
Andrew Saxton  
Gary Schellenberger  
Kyle Seeback  
Bev Shipley  
Devinder Shory  
Joy Smith  
Robert Sopuck  
Brian Storseth  
Mark Strahl  
David Sweet  
David Tilson  
Lawrence Toet  
Brad Trost  
Bernard Trotter  
Susan Truppe  
Dave Van Kesteren  
Maurice Vellacott  
Mike Wallace  
Mark Warawa  
Chris Warkentin  
Jeff Watson  
John Weston  
David Wilks  
John Williamson  
Stephen Woodworth  
Terence Young  
Wai Young  
Bob Zimmer

**STATUS OF WOMEN****Chair:** H el ene LeBlanc**Vice-Chairs:**Kirsty Duncan  
Tilly O'Neill GordonStella Ambler  
Niki Ashton  
Joyce BatemanJoan Crockatt  
Annick PapillonDjaouida Sellah  
Susan TruppeTerence Young  
Wai Young

(12)

**Associate Members**Diane Ablonczy  
Eve Adams  
Mark Adler  
Dan Albas  
Harold Albrecht  
Mike Allen  
Dean Allison  
Rob Anders  
David Anderson  
Scott Armstrong  
Keith Ashfield  
Jay Aspin  
Leon Benoit  
James Bezan  
Lysane Blanchette-Lamothe  
Kelly Block  
Fran oise Boivin  
Ray Boughen  
Peter Braid  
Garry Breitzkreuz  
Gordon Brown  
Lois Brown  
Patrick Brown  
Rod Bruinooge  
Brad Butt  
Paul Calandra  
Blaine Calkins  
Ron Cannan  
John Carmichael  
Colin Carrie  
Corneliu ChisuMichael Chong  
Rob Clarke  
Jean Crowder  
Joe Daniel  
Patricia Davidson  
Libby Davies  
Anne-Marie Day  
Bob Dechert  
Earl Dreshen  
Rick Dykstra  
Steven Fletcher  
Myl ene Freeman  
Royal Galipeau  
Cheryl Gallant  
Parm Gill  
Robert Goguen  
Peter Goldring  
Jacques Gourde  
Nina Grewal  
Sadia Groguh e  
Richard Harris  
Laurie Hawn  
Bryan Hayes  
Russ Hiebert  
Jim Hillyer  
Randy Hoback  
Ed Holder  
Roxanne James  
Brian Jean  
Peter Julian  
Randy KampGerald Keddy  
Peter Kent  
Greg Kerr  
Ed Komarnicki  
Daryl Kramp  
Mike Lake  
Guy Lauzon  
Ryan Leef  
Pierre Lemieux  
Megan Leslie  
Chungsen Leung  
Wladyslaw Lizon  
Ben Lobb  
Tom Lukiwski  
James Lunney  
Dave MacKenzie  
Irene Mathysen  
Colin Mayes  
Phil McColeman  
Cathy McLeod  
Costas Menegakis  
Ted Menzies  
Rob Merrifield  
Larry Miller  
Rick Norlock  
Deepak Obhrai  
Gordon O'Connor  
Ted Opitz  
Erin O'Toole  
LaVar PayneJoe Preston  
James Rajotte  
Scott Reid  
Blake Richards  
Andrew Saxton  
Gary Schellenberger  
Kyle Seeback  
Bev Shipley  
Devinder Shory  
Joy Smith  
Robert Sopuck  
Brian Storseth  
Mark Strahl  
David Sweet  
David Tilson  
Lawrence Toet  
Brad Trost  
Bernard Trottier  
Dave Van Kesteren  
Maurice Vellacott  
Mike Wallace  
Mark Warawa  
Chris Warkentin  
Jeff Watson  
John Weston  
Rodney Weston  
David Wilks  
John Williamson  
Stephen Woodworth  
Bob Zimmer

## TRANSPORT, INFRASTRUCTURE AND COMMUNITIES

**Chair:** Larry Miller

**Vice-Chairs:**

Olivia Chow  
David McGuinty

Harold Albrecht  
Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet  
Peter Braid

Ed Komarnicki  
Hoang Mai

Mike Sullivan  
Lawrence Toet

Jeff Watson  
Wai Young

(12)

### Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy  
Eve Adams  
Mark Adler  
Dan Albas  
Mike Allen  
Dean Allison  
Stella Ambler  
Rob Anders  
David Anderson  
Scott Armstrong  
Keith Ashfield  
Jay Aspin  
Robert Aubin  
Joyce Bateman  
Leon Benoit  
James Bezan  
Kelly Block  
Ray Boughen  
Alexandre Boulerice  
Garry Breitzkreuz  
Gordon Brown  
Lois Brown  
Patrick Brown  
Rod Bruinooge  
Brad Butt  
Paul Calandra  
Blaine Calkins  
Ron Cannan  
John Carmichael  
Guy Caron

Colin Carrie  
Corneliu Chisu  
Michael Chong  
Rob Clarke  
Joan Crockatt  
Joe Daniel  
Patricia Davidson  
Bob Dechert  
Earl Dreshen  
Rick Dykstra  
Steven Fletcher  
Royal Galipeau  
Cheryl Gallant  
Parm Gill  
Robert Goguen  
Peter Goldring  
Jacques Gourde  
Nina Grewal  
Richard Harris  
Laurie Hawn  
Bryan Hayes  
Russ Hiebert  
Jim Hillyer  
Randy Hoback  
Ed Holder  
Roxanne James  
Brian Jean  
Randy Kamp  
Gerald Keddy

Peter Kent  
Greg Kerr  
Daryl Kramp  
Mike Lake  
Guy Lauzon  
Ryan Leef  
Pierre Lemieux  
Chungsen Leung  
Wladyslaw Lizon  
Ben Lobb  
Tom Lukiwski  
James Lunney  
Dave MacKenzie  
Colin Mayes  
Phil McColeman  
Cathy McLeod  
Costas Menegakis  
Ted Menzies  
Rob Merrifield  
Isabelle Morin  
Pierre Nantel  
Rick Norlock  
Deepak Obhrai  
Gordon O'Connor  
Tilly O'Neill Gordon  
Ted Opitz  
Erin O'Toole  
LaVar Payne  
Joe Preston

James Rajotte  
Scott Reid  
Blake Richards  
Andrew Saxton  
Gary Schellenberger  
Kyle Seeback  
Bev Shipley  
Devinder Shory  
Joy Smith  
Robert Sopuck  
Brian Storseth  
Mark Strahl  
David Sweet  
David Tilson  
Brad Trost  
Bernard Trotter  
Susan Truppe  
Dave Van Kesteren  
Maurice Vellacott  
Mike Wallace  
Mark Warawa  
Chris Warkentin  
John Weston  
Rodney Weston  
David Wilks  
John Williamson  
Stephen Woodworth  
Terence Young  
Bob Zimmer

**VETERANS AFFAIRS****Chair:**

Royal Galipeau

**Vice-Chairs:**Jim Karygiannis  
Peter StofferSylvain Chicoine  
Corneliu Chisu  
Parm GillLaurie Hawn  
Bryan HayesWladyslaw Lizon  
Ben LobbManon Perreault  
John Rafferty

(12)

**Associate Members**Diane Ablonczy  
Eve Adams  
Mark Adler  
Dan Albas  
Harold Albrecht  
Mike Allen  
Dean Allison  
Stella Ambler  
Rob Anders  
David Anderson  
Scott Armstrong  
Keith Ashfield  
Jay Aspin  
Joyce Bateman  
Leon Benoit  
James Bezan  
Kelly Block  
Ray Boughen  
Peter Braid  
Garry Breitzkreuz  
Gordon Brown  
Lois Brown  
Patrick Brown  
Rod Bruinooge  
Brad Butt  
Paul Calandra  
Blaine Calkins  
Ron Cannan  
John Carmichael  
Colin CarrieMichael Chong  
Rob Clarke  
Joan Crockett  
Joe Daniel  
Patricia Davidson  
Bob Dechert  
Earl Dreeshen  
Rick Dykstra  
Steven Fletcher  
Mylène Freeman  
Cheryl Gallant  
Robert Goguen  
Peter Goldring  
Jacques Gourde  
Nina Grewal  
Jack Harris  
Richard Harris  
Russ Hiebert  
Jim Hillyer  
Randy Hoback  
Ed Holder  
Roxanne James  
Brian Jean  
Peter Julian  
Randy Kamp  
Gerald Keddy  
Peter Kent  
Greg Kerr  
Ed KomarnickiDaryl Kramp  
Mike Lake  
Guy Lauzon  
Ryan Leef  
Pierre Lemieux  
Chungsen Leung  
Tom Lukiwski  
James Lunney  
Dave MacKenzie  
Pat Martin  
Irene Mathysen  
Colin Mayes  
Phil McColeman  
Cathy McLeod  
Costas Menegakis  
Ted Menzies  
Rob Merrifield  
Larry Miller  
Rick Norlock  
Deepak Obhrai  
Gordon O'Connor  
Tilly O'Neill Gordon  
Ted Opitz  
Erin O'Toole  
LaVar Payne  
Joe Preston  
James Rajotte  
Scott Reid  
Blake RichardsAndrew Saxton  
Gary Schellenberger  
Kyle Seeback  
Bev Shipley  
Devinder Shory  
Joy Smith  
Robert Sopuck  
Brian Storseth  
Mark Strahl  
David Sweet  
David Tilson  
Lawrence Toet  
Brad Trost  
Bernard Trotter  
Susan Truppe  
Dave Van Kesteren  
Maurice Vellacott  
Mike Wallace  
Mark Warawa  
Chris Warkentin  
Jeff Watson  
John Weston  
Rodney Weston  
David Wilks  
John Williamson  
Stephen Woodworth  
Terence Young  
Wai Young  
Bob Zimmer

## STANDING JOINT COMMITTEES

### LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

**Joint Chairs:** Marie-P. Charette-Poulin  
Greg Kerr

**Joint Vice-Chairs:** Carol Hughes  
Scott Simms

Representing the Senate:  
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Anne C. Cools  
Nicole Eaton

Terry M. Mercer  
Michel Rivard

Rod Bruinooge  
Blaine Calkins  
Peter Goldring  
Peter Kent  
Peggy Nash

José Nunez-Melo  
François Pilon  
Brad Trost  
Mark Warawa

(17)

#### Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy  
Eve Adams  
Mark Adler  
Dan Albas  
Harold Albrecht  
Mike Allen  
Dean Allison  
Stella Ambler  
Rob Anders  
David Anderson  
Scott Armstrong  
Keith Ashfield  
Jay Aspin  
Joyce Bateman  
Leon Benoit  
James Bezan  
Kelly Block  
Ray Boughen  
Peter Braid  
Garry Breitkreuz  
Gordon Brown  
Lois Brown  
Patrick Brown  
Brad Butt  
Paul Calandra  
Ron Cannan  
John Carmichael  
Colin Carrie  
Corneliu Chisu

Michael Chong  
David Christopherson  
Rob Clarke  
Joan Crockatt  
Joe Daniel  
Patricia Davidson  
Bob Dechert  
Earl Dreeshen  
Rick Dykstra  
Steven Fletcher  
Royal Galipeau  
Cheryl Gallant  
Parm Gill  
Robert Goguen  
Jacques Gourde  
Nina Grewal  
Richard Harris  
Laurie Hawn  
Bryan Hayes  
Russ Hiebert  
Jim Hillyer  
Randy Hoback  
Ed Holder  
Roxanne James  
Brian Jean  
Peter Julian  
Randy Kamp  
Gerald Keddy  
Ed Komarnicki

Daryl Kramp  
Mike Lake  
Guy Lauzon  
Ryan Leef  
Pierre Lemieux  
Chungsen Leung  
Wladyslaw Lizon  
Ben Lobb  
Tom Lukiwski  
James Lunney  
Dave MacKenzie  
Colin Mayes  
Phil McColeman  
Cathy McLeod  
Costas Menegakis  
Ted Menzies  
Rob Merrifield  
Larry Miller  
Rick Norlock  
Deepak Obhrai  
Gordon O'Connor  
Tilly O'Neill Gordon  
Ted Opitz  
Erin O'Toole  
LaVar Payne  
Joe Preston  
James Rajotte  
Scott Reid

Blake Richards  
Andrew Saxton  
Gary Schellenberger  
Kyle Seeback  
Bev Shipley  
Devinder Shory  
Joy Smith  
Robert Sopuck  
Brian Storseth  
Mark Strahl  
David Sweet  
David Tilson  
Lawrence Toet  
Bernard Trottier  
Susan Truppe  
Dave Van Kesteren  
Maurice Vellacott  
Mike Wallace  
Chris Warkentin  
Jeff Watson  
John Weston  
Rodney Weston  
David Wilks  
John Williamson  
Stephen Woodworth  
Terence Young  
Wai Young  
Bob Zimmer



## SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS

**Joint Chairs:** Chris Charlton  
Bob Runciman

**Joint Vice-Chairs:** Mauril Bélanger  
Garry Breitkreuz

Representing the Senate:  
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Denise Batters  
Larry W. Campbell  
Céline Hervieux-Payette  
Wilfred P. Moore

Nancy Ruth  
Scott Tannas  
Betty E. Unger

Dan Albas  
Stella Ambler  
Rob Anders  
Paulina Ayala  
Rob Clarke

Réjean Genest  
Sana Hassainia  
Gary Schellenberger  
Maurice Vellacott

(20)

### Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy  
Eve Adams  
Mark Adler  
Harold Albrecht  
Mike Allen  
Dean Allison  
David Anderson  
Scott Armstrong  
Keith Ashfield  
Jay Aspin  
Joyce Bateman  
Leon Benoit  
James Bezan  
Kelly Block  
Ray Boughen  
Peter Braid  
Gordon Brown  
Lois Brown  
Patrick Brown  
Rod Bruinooge  
Brad Butt  
Paul Calandra  
Blaine Calkins  
Ron Cannan  
John Carmichael  
Colin Carrie  
Corneliu Chisu  
Michael Chong  
Joan Crockatt

Joe Daniel  
Patricia Davidson  
Bob Dechert  
Earl Dreeshen  
Rick Dykstra  
Steven Fletcher  
Royal Galipeau  
Cheryl Gallant  
Parm Gill  
Robert Goguen  
Peter Goldring  
Jacques Gourde  
Nina Grewal  
Richard Harris  
Laurie Hawn  
Bryan Hayes  
Russ Hiebert  
Jim Hillyer  
Randy Hoback  
Ed Holder  
Roxanne James  
Brian Jean  
Peter Julian  
Randy Kamp  
Gerald Keddy  
Peter Kent  
Greg Kerr  
Ed Komarnicki  
Daryl Kramp

Mike Lake  
Guy Lauzon  
Ryan Leef  
Pierre Lemieux  
Chungsen Leung  
Wladyslaw Lizon  
Ben Lobb  
Tom Lukiwski  
James Lunney  
Dave MacKenzie  
Brian Masse  
Colin Mayes  
Phil McColeman  
Cathy McLeod  
Costas Menegakis  
Bryan Hayes  
Rob Merrifield  
Larry Miller  
Rick Norlock  
Deepak Obhrai  
Gordon O'Connor  
Tilly O'Neill Gordon  
Ted Opitz  
Erin O'Toole  
LaVar Payne  
Joe Preston  
James Rajotte  
Scott Reid

Blake Richards  
Andrew Saxton  
Kyle Seeback  
Bev Shipley  
Devinder Shory  
Joy Smith  
Robert Sopuck  
Brian Storseth  
Mark Strahl  
David Sweet  
David Tilson  
Lawrence Toet  
Brad Trost  
Bernard Trotter  
Susan Truppe  
Dave Van Kesteren  
Mike Wallace  
Mark Warawa  
Chris Warkentin  
Jeff Watson  
John Weston  
Rodney Weston  
David Wilks  
John Williamson  
Stephen Woodworth  
Terence Young  
Wai Young  
Bob Zimmer

**Panel of Chairs of Legislative Committees**

**The Deputy Speaker and Chair of Committees of the Whole**

MR. JOE COMARTIN

**The Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole**

MR. BARRY DEVOLIN

**The Assistant Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole**

MR. BRUCE STANTON

## THE MINISTRY

According to precedence

Right Hon. Stephen Harper	Prime Minister
Hon. Bernard Valcourt	Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development
Hon. Rob Nicholson	Minister of National Defence
Hon. Peter MacKay	Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
Hon. Rona Ambrose	Minister of Health
Hon. Diane Finley	Minister of Public Works and Government Services
Hon. John Baird	Minister of Foreign Affairs
Hon. Tony Clement	President of the Treasury Board
Hon. Jim Flaherty	Minister of Finance
Hon. Peter Van Loan	Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
Hon. Jason Kenney	Minister of Employment and Social Development and Minister for Multiculturalism
Hon. Gerry Ritz	Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
Hon. Christian Paradis	Minister of International Development and Minister for La Francophonie
Hon. James Moore	Minister of Industry
Hon. Denis Lebel	Minister of Infrastructure, Communities and Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister of the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec
Hon. Leona Aglukkaq	Minister of the Environment, Minister of the Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency and Minister for the Arctic Council
Hon. Lisa Raitt	Minister of Transport
Hon. Gail Shea	Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Hon. Julian Fantino	Minister of Veterans Affairs
Hon. Steven Blaney	Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness
Hon. Ed Fast	Minister of International Trade
Hon. Joe Oliver	Minister of Natural Resources
Hon. Kerry-Lynne D. Findlay	Minister of National Revenue
Hon. Shelly Glover	Minister of Canadian Heritage and Official Languages
Hon. Chris Alexander	Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
Hon. Kellie Leitch	Minister of Labour and Minister of Status of Women
Hon. Maxime Bernier	Minister of State (Small Business and Tourism, and Agriculture)
Hon. Lynne Yelich	Minister of State (Foreign Affairs and Consular)
Hon. Gary Goodyear	Minister of State (Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario)
Hon. Rob Moore	Minister of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)
Hon. John Duncan	Minister of State and Chief Government Whip
Hon. Tim Uppal	Minister of State (Multiculturalism)
Hon. Alice Wong	Minister of State (Seniors)
Hon. Bal Gosal	Minister of State (Sport)
Hon. Kevin Sorenson	Minister of State (Finance)
Hon. Pierre Poilievre	Minister of State (Democratic Reform)
Hon. Candice Bergen	Minister of State (Social Development)
Hon. Greg Rickford	Minister of State (Science and Technology, and Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario)
Hon. Michelle Rempel	Minister of State (Western Economic Diversification)

## PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES

Hon. Mike Lake	to the Minister of Industry
Mr. Gerald Keddy	to the Minister of National Revenue and for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency
Hon. Deepak Obhrai	to the Minister of Foreign Affairs and for International Human Rights
Mr. David Anderson	to the Minister of Foreign Affairs
Mr. James Bezan	to the Minister of National Defence
Mr. Colin Carrie	to the Minister of the Environment
Mr. Randy Kamp	to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Mr. Tom Lukiwski	to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
Mr. Jeff Watson	to the Minister of Transport
Mr. Rick Dykstra	to the Minister of Canadian Heritage
Mr. Jacques Gourde	to the Prime Minister, for Official Languages and for the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec
Mr. Pierre Lemieux	to the Minister of Agriculture
Mrs. Kelly Block	to the Minister of Natural Resources
Mr. Peter Braid	for Infrastructure and Communities
Ms. Lois Brown	to the Minister of International Development
Mr. Paul Calandra	to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs
Mr. Bob Dechert	to the Minister of Justice
Mrs. Cathy McLeod	to the Minister of Labour and for Western Economic Diversification
Mr. Andrew Saxton	to the Minister of Finance
Mr. Scott Armstrong	to the Minister of Employment and Social Development
Ms. Eve Adams	to the Minister of Health
Mr. Dan Albas	to the President of the Treasury Board
Mr. Parm Gill	to the Minister of Veterans Affairs
Mr. Robert Goguen	to the Minister of Justice
Ms. Roxanne James	to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness
Mr. Chungsen Leung	for Multiculturalism
Mr. Costas Menegakis	to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
Mr. Mark Strahl	to the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development
Mr. Bernard Trotter	to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services
Mrs. Susan Truppe	for Status of Women
Mr. Erin O'Toole	to the Minister of International Trade

# CONTENTS

Friday, November 22, 2013

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### Drug-Free Prisons Act

Mr. Uppal (for the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness) .....	1245
Bill C-12. Second reading .....	1245
Ms. James .....	1245
Mr. Garrison .....	1246
Mr. Rankin .....	1246
Mr. Sandhu .....	1246
Mr. Norlock .....	1247
Ms. Sims .....	1248
Mr. MacAulay .....	1248
Mr. Garrison .....	1248
Mr. Norlock .....	1252
Ms. Fry .....	1252
Mr. Sandhu .....	1252
Mr. Bevington .....	1252
Mr. Lamoureux .....	1253

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

### Supply Management

Mr. Bellavance .....	1253
----------------------	------

### William Fraser Bell

Mr. Menegakis .....	1253
---------------------	------

### Officer of the Order of Canada

Mr. Rankin .....	1254
------------------	------

### Food Processing Facility in Colborne

Mr. Norlock .....	1254
-------------------	------

### Grey Cup

Mr. Goodale .....	1254
-------------------	------

### Volunteer Search and Rescue Organizations

Mr. Albas .....	1254
-----------------	------

### Canada's Food Banks

Mr. Giguère .....	1254
-------------------	------

### Gas Tax Fund

Mr. Vellacott .....	1255
---------------------	------

### Typhoon Haiyan Relief Efforts

Mr. Daniel .....	1255
------------------	------

### Louiseville Christmas Telethon

Ms. Brosseau .....	1255
--------------------	------

### The Economy

Mr. Williamson .....	1255
----------------------	------

### The Environment

Mr. Bevington .....	1255
---------------------	------

### The Economy

Mrs. Block .....	1256
------------------	------

### Grey Cup

Mr. Valeriotte .....	1256
----------------------	------

### Health

Ms. Adams .....	1256
-----------------	------

### Ethics

Mr. Godin .....	1256
-----------------	------

### Ethics

Mrs. Truppe .....	1256
-------------------	------

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### Ethics

Ms. Turmel .....	1257
Mr. Calandra .....	1257
Ms. Turmel .....	1257
Mr. Calandra .....	1257
Ms. Turmel .....	1257
Mr. Calandra .....	1257
Mr. Rankin .....	1257
Mr. Calandra .....	1257
Mr. Rankin .....	1257
Mr. Calandra .....	1257
Mr. Lamoureux .....	1257
Mr. Calandra .....	1258
Mr. Lamoureux .....	1258
Mr. Calandra .....	1258
Mr. Lamoureux .....	1258
Mr. Calandra .....	1258
Mr. Chisholm .....	1258
Mr. Calandra .....	1258
Mr. Chisholm .....	1258
Mr. Calandra .....	1258
Ms. Sims .....	1259
Mr. Calandra .....	1259
Ms. Sims .....	1259
Mr. Calandra .....	1259
Mr. Caron .....	1259
Mr. Calandra .....	1259
Mr. Caron .....	1259
Mr. Calandra .....	1259
Mr. Brahmi .....	1259
Mr. Calandra .....	1260
Mr. Brahmi .....	1260
Mr. Calandra .....	1260
Ms. Brosseau .....	1260
Mr. Calandra .....	1260
Mr. McCallum .....	1260
Mr. Calandra .....	1260
Mr. McCallum .....	1260
Mr. Calandra .....	1260
Mr. Goodale .....	1261
Mr. Calandra .....	1261

Mr. Sandhu .....	1261
Mr. Calandra .....	1261
Mr. Giguère .....	1261
Mr. Calandra .....	1261
Mr. Nunez-Melo .....	1261
Mr. Calandra .....	1261
Mr. Nicholls .....	1261
Mr. Calandra .....	1261
<b>Public Safety</b>	
Mr. Norlock .....	1261
Ms. James .....	1262
<b>Aboriginal Affairs</b>	
Mr. Saganash .....	1262
Mr. Calandra .....	1262
Mr. Saganash .....	1262
Mr. Valcourt .....	1262
Ms. Crowder .....	1262
Mr. Valcourt .....	1262
Ms. Crowder .....	1262
Mr. Valcourt .....	1262
<b>Automotive Industry</b>	
Ms. Sgro .....	1263
Mr. Goodyear .....	1263
Ms. Sgro .....	1263
Mr. Goodyear .....	1263
<b>Champlain Bridge</b>	
Mr. Nantel .....	1263
Mr. Gourde .....	1263
Mr. Nantel .....	1263
Mr. Gourde .....	1263
<b>Status of Women</b>	
Mr. Sweet .....	1263
Mr. Anderson .....	1263
<b>Air Transportation</b>	
Ms. Jones .....	1264
Mr. Watson .....	1264
<b>The Environment</b>	
Mr. Bevington .....	1264
Mr. Valcourt .....	1264
<b>Multiculturalism</b>	
Mr. Zimmer .....	1264
Mr. Uppal .....	1264
<b>Air Transportation</b>	
Mr. Bellavance .....	1264
Mrs. McLeod .....	1264
<b>Firearms Registry</b>	
Mr. Bellavance .....	1265
Ms. James .....	1265
<b>Public Service of Canada</b>	
Mr. Rathgeber .....	1265
Mr. Dechert .....	1265

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

<b>Ways and Means</b>	
<b>Notice of Motion</b>	
Mr. Uppal .....	1265
<b>Government Response to Petitions</b>	
Mr. Lukiwski .....	1265
<b>Petitions</b>	
<b>Navigable Waters Protection Act</b>	
Ms. Crowder .....	1265
<b>Taxation</b>	
Ms. Crowder .....	1265
<b>Genetically Modified Alfalfa</b>	
Ms. Crowder .....	1265
<b>Mining Industry</b>	
Mr. Valerioté .....	1266
<b>Questions on the Order Paper</b>	
Mr. Lukiwski .....	1266

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

<b>Drug-Free Prisons Act</b>	
Bill C-12. Second reading .....	1266
Mr. Lamoureux .....	1266
Mr. Kramp .....	1268
Mr. Godin .....	1268
Mr. Chisholm .....	1269
Mr. Kramp .....	1269
Mr. Sandhu .....	1270
Mr. Payne .....	1271
Mr. Sandhu .....	1272
Ms. James .....	1272
Mr. Kramp .....	1273
Mr. Sandhu .....	1273
Ms. James .....	1275
Ms. Crowder .....	1275
Mr. Chisholm .....	1276
Ms. Sims .....	1276

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

<b>CBC and Public Service Disclosure and Transparency Act</b>	
Bill C-461. Report stage .....	1276
<b>Speaker's Ruling</b>	
The Acting Speaker (Mr. Stanton) .....	1276
<b>Motions in amendment</b>	
Mr. Rathgeber .....	1276
Motions Nos. 1 to 8 .....	1276
Mr. Albas .....	1278
Mr. Nantel .....	1279
Mr. Lamoureux .....	1281
Mr. Williamson .....	1282
Mr. Rankin .....	1283
Ms. Sims .....	1284

## APPENDIX

Published under the authority of the Speaker of  
the House of Commons

---

### SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

---

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the *Copyright Act*. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a Committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the *Copyright Act*.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its Committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

---

Also available on the Parliament of Canada Web Site at the following address: <http://www.parl.gc.ca>

Publié en conformité de l'autorité  
du Président de la Chambre des communes

---

### PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

---

Il est permis de reproduire les délibérations de la Chambre et de ses comités, en tout ou en partie, sur n'importe quel support, pourvu que la reproduction soit exacte et qu'elle ne soit pas présentée comme version officielle. Il n'est toutefois pas permis de reproduire, de distribuer ou d'utiliser les délibérations à des fins commerciales visant la réalisation d'un profit financier. Toute reproduction ou utilisation non permise ou non formellement autorisée peut être considérée comme une violation du droit d'auteur aux termes de la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*. Une autorisation formelle peut être obtenue sur présentation d'une demande écrite au Bureau du Président de la Chambre.

La reproduction conforme à la présente permission ne constitue pas une publication sous l'autorité de la Chambre. Le privilège absolu qui s'applique aux délibérations de la Chambre ne s'étend pas aux reproductions permises. Lorsqu'une reproduction comprend des mémoires présentés à un comité de la Chambre, il peut être nécessaire d'obtenir de leurs auteurs l'autorisation de les reproduire, conformément à la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*.

La présente permission ne porte pas atteinte aux privilèges, pouvoirs, immunités et droits de la Chambre et de ses comités. Il est entendu que cette permission ne touche pas l'interdiction de contester ou de mettre en cause les délibérations de la Chambre devant les tribunaux ou autrement. La Chambre conserve le droit et le privilège de déclarer l'utilisateur coupable d'outrage au Parlement lorsque la reproduction ou l'utilisation n'est pas conforme à la présente permission.

---

Aussi disponible sur le site Web du Parlement du Canada à l'adresse suivante : <http://www.parl.gc.ca>